## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA EASTERN DIVISION

		) )	
VARIETY	STORES, INC.,	)	
	Plaintiff,	)	
	VS.	) CASE NO.	5:14-CV-217-BC
WALMART	STORES, INC., Defendant.	) ) ) )	

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2018

JURY TRIAL/DAY 1

BEFORE THE HONORABLE TERRENCE W. BOYLE

UNITED STATES CHIEF JUDGE

## MICHELLE A. McGIRR, RPR, CRR, CRC

Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
Raleigh, North Carolina
(Stenotype with computer-aided transcription)

1	On Behalf of the Plaintiff:	
2		
3	W. THAD ADAMS, III, Esquire S. ALEX LONG, JR., Esquire	
4	CHRISTINA DAVIDSON TRIMMER, ES SHUMAKER, LOOP & KENDRICK, LLP	_
5	101 South Tryon Street Suite 2200	
6	Charlotte, North Carolina 282	80
7	SCOTT P. SHAW, Esquire CALL & JENSEN	
8	610 Newport Center Drive Suite 700	
9	Newport Beach, California 926	560
10		
11		
12		
13	On Behalf of the Defendant:	
14	MARK PUZELLA, Esquire	
15	SHERYL KOVAL GARKO, Esquire FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.	
16	One Marina Park Drive Boston, MA 02210-1878	
17	R. DAVID HOSP, Esquire	
18	FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. 601 Lexington Avenue	
19	52nd Floor New York, New York 10022	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
1
                                 INDEX
 2
    OPENING REMARKS TO THE JURY:
 3
                   By the Court, at page 62
 4
    OPENING STATEMENTS:
 5
                   By Mr. Adams, at page 67
 6
                   By Mr. Puzella, at page 80
 7
    WITNESS:
 8
                   Timothy Blackburn II
 9
    EXAMINATION:
                                                                  PAGE
10
                   Direct Examination by Mr. Adams
                                                                  89
11
                   Cross-Examination by Mr. Puzella
                                                                  150
                   Redirect Examination by Mr. Adams
                                                                  170
12
    WITNESS:
13
                   Karen Dineen (via deposition)
14
                   [As read into the record by Attorney Trimmer]
15
    EXAMINATION:
16
                                                                  175
                   Direct Examination by Mr. Adams
17
18
    PLAINTFF'S EXHIBITS:
19
    No.
                                                             In Evid.
20
     58
                                                                  106
     P-1
                                                                  107
21
     P - 58 (E)
                                                                  108
     P-59(pg. 22)
                                                                  110
    P-59(pg. 15)
                                                                  112
22
    P-59(pq. 1)
                                                                  112
23
    P-59(Pg. 30)
                                                                  112
     78
                                                                  114
24
     P - 57
                                                                  116
     P - 63
                                                                  118
25
                            (Continuing...)
```

```
1
                                    I-N-D-E-X
                                  (Continued...)
 2
 3
     PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS:
 4
     No.
                                                                      In Evid.
 5
     P-8
                                                                            122
     P-2
                                                                            124
 6
                                                                            129
     P - 62
     PX-2
                                                                            134
 7
     PX-3
                                                                            136
     PX-4
                                                                            136
     PX-5
                                                                            137
 8
     P-6 and P-7
                                                                            142
 9
     P87(A) and P87(B)
                                                                            144
                                                                            146
     PX-8
10
     P - 22
                                                                            173
     59
                                                                            173
11
     79
                                                                            173
     (79 withdrawn at pg. 174)
12
     P - 71
                                                                            191
     P - 72
                                                                            191
     P-14
13
                                                                            191
     P-5
                                                                            191
14
15
16
17
18
     DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS:
19
     \underline{\text{No}} .
                                                        ΙD
                                                                      In Evid.
20
     D - 50
                                                                            161
     D - 191
                                                                            167
21
22
23
24
25
```

(Monday, October 22, 2018, commencing at 10:05 a.m.)

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you for being here. We're going to pick a jury and commence the civil trial of a lawsuit involving a trademark.

And at this time I would ask the clerk to give you the oath and then we'll call a group into the jury box.

THE CLERK: Please stand and raise your right hand to be sworn.

(Jury panel sworn)

THE COURT: Go ahead.

THE CLERK: Please come forward. Gladys Gunia,

Justus Anderson, Martha Nixon, Clark Twiddy, Vera Carr,

Howard Grogan, Robert Mizelle, Keith Harmon, Eleanor Bond,

Lynn Riche, Sonya Dent, Steven Neithamer, Brittany Wilson and

Jo Ann Cahoon.

(Potential jurors seated in the jury box)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Terrence Boyle. I am a federal trial judge and we're here in the United States District Court in Elizabeth City. This is the Eastern District of North Carolina. It covers half the state. We have courthouses in Raleigh, Fayetteville, Wilmington, New Bern, Greenville and Elizabeth City. My chambers are here in Elizabeth City primarily and

so this trial will be conducted here.

This is a federal trademark case. Intellectual property trademark. The United States laws authorize people who own products and market them to have trademarks and you're familiar with that. You see them every day. The Coca-Cola bottle, the Polo pony, the Nike splash. Those are all things that are in everyone's common-day knowledge. This is a lawsuit between two, what would you call them, commercial forces in the business world, in the community.

The plaintiff is Roses or Variety Wholesalers, which is the parent company of Roses. I think, but I may not be exactly correct, that Roses or Variety brands, what, Eagles maybe, do you have Eagles?

MR. ADAMS: I don't believe so, your Honor.

THE COURT: What do you have? Do you have Family

Dollar or Dollar -- what are some of the other brand names?

MR. ADAMS: There's a Dollar Store, Maxway, several other smaller brands.

THE COURT: But Roses is the principal outlet?

MR. ADAMS: By far.

THE COURT: Okay. So Variety is a regional discount retail store which you may or may not be familiar with. There are plenty of them around here.

The defendant is Walmart. The actual Walmart. So what they're in suit over is the marketing and trademark for

grills and grill accessories and outdoor products.

In 1994, Variety had a registered trademark called The Backyard. That's the trademark. And it has that for retail store supplies in garden equipment and supplies.

Variety uses The Backyard trademark to market outdoor products, grills, grill accessories.

They also use Backyard Barbecue, but that's not a registered trademark, but they have a trademark protection for -- if it's established, for that product. Over the course of time they've sold a lot of products with that brand.

In 2010, Walmart began selling grills and grill accessories with the brand on them called Backyard Barbecue. Later that brand became Backyard Grill. This lawsuit was started to stop Walmart from using that registered trademark or something that caused a likelihood of confusion between that registered trademark, which is The Backyard -- Just think of that -- and whether Walmart's sale and branding of similar products violates that trademark.

The case is not going to be highly complicated.

It's a fairly simple thing. A group of you will be sworn to serve as the jurors in the case and you will have to decide whether Walmart's use of the protected mark or something like the protected mark creates confusion so that someone would buy the product at Walmart thinking that it was the other

```
1
    product. Does that make any sense to you?
2
              So as I said, it's going to ask you to rely on your
3
    common sense, your judgment. I'm going to ask you some
 4
    questions because these lawyers want to know who you are, but
5
    it's something that everybody should have some familiarity
    with in eastern North Carolina or in the state. So we'll go
 6
7
    through like that.
              I'll just jump right in. Raise your hand if
8
9
    you've -- if you've shopped at some point in time in Walmart.
10
    Anybody who hasn't?
11
                          (No hands raised)
12
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. You are Ms. Gunia. How do you
13
    pronounce your name? Gunia.
14
              THE JUROR: I raised my hand.
15
              THE COURT: I'm going to just talk to you for a
16
    minute. What's your last name?
17
              THE JUROR:
                           Gunia.
18
              THE COURT:
                           Gunia, okay. Where do you live?
19
              THE JUROR: I live in Elizabeth City.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. And do you work?
21
              THE JUROR:
                          I'm retired.
22
              THE COURT:
                           What did you do before that?
23
              THE JUROR:
                           I was an electronics engineer.
24
              THE COURT:
                          Where did you work?
25
              THE JUROR:
                           I worked in mostly Philadelphia for 26
```

```
1
    years.
 2
               THE COURT: How long have you been in Elizabeth
 3
    City?
 4
               THE JUROR: Almost 15.
 5
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. And do you ever shop at Walmart?
 6
               THE JUROR:
                           Yes.
 7
               THE COURT: You go every day, every week, every
 8
    month, every year, every five years, how would
 9
    you characterize --
10
               THE JUROR: Probably every month.
11
               THE COURT: Every month. And without being nosey,
12
    what kind of things do you buy at Walmart?
13
               THE JUROR:
                          Groceries.
14
               THE COURT: Groceries, okay. Do you ever buy
15
    hardware or fixtures, things like that?
                           I'm sure I have.
16
               THE JUROR:
17
                           Have you ever bought a grill there?
               THE COURT:
18
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
19
               THE COURT:
                           Have you ever bought a grill anywhere?
20
               THE JUROR: Yes.
21
               THE COURT:
                          Where would you buy one?
22
               THE JUROR:
                          Lowe's.
23
               THE COURT:
                          Lowe's, okay. Do you think that --
24
    what kind of -- when you went to Lowe's -- have you bought a
25
    grill more than once at Lowe's?
```

```
THE JUROR: I don't believe so.
1
2
               THE COURT:
                          Was it a gas grill or a charcoal grill?
 3
               THE JUROR: It's gas.
 4
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. And why did you go to Lowe's?
5
               THE JUROR:
                          We shop there a lot and they had a
6
    grill I liked.
7
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. Have you ever bought any outdoor
8
    products like lawn chairs or tables or anything from either
9
    Roses or Walmart?
10
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
11
               THE COURT:
                          You have.
12
               THE JUROR:
                           Yes.
               THE COURT: What have you bought?
13
14
               THE JUROR:
                           I bought some patio furniture.
15
               THE COURT:
                           Where did you buy that?
                           Walmart.
16
               THE JUROR:
17
                           Have you ever shopped at Roses?
               THE COURT:
18
               THE JUROR:
                           Yes.
19
               THE COURT: What do you buy at Roses?
20
               THE JUROR: Cleaning products.
21
               THE COURT: Do you look for brand names when you're
22
    at Roses or do you look for price points?
23
               THE JUROR: Brand names.
24
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
25
               Mr. Anderson, where do you live?
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: I live in Edenton, sir.
 2
              THE COURT: And that's in Chowan County?
 3
              THE JUROR: Chowan County.
 4
              THE COURT: And what do you do for a living?
 5
              THE JUROR: I'm retired.
 6
              THE COURT:
                         What did you used to do?
 7
              THE JUROR: I was a former Navy Seal and worked on
 8
    government contracts.
 9
              THE COURT: So you served on active duty in the
10
    Navy?
11
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
12
              THE COURT: For how long?
13
              THE JUROR: Just a little over 20 years.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. And what brings you to Chowan
15
    County? Were you from there?
16
              THE JUROR: No. I met my wife in Hertford and I
17
    worked at some of the local bases and ended up retiring
18
    there.
19
              THE COURT: There's no Walmart in Chowan County.
20
    The closest ones are either Williamson, Ahoskie or Elizabeth
21
    City, I think.
22
              THE JUROR: That's correct.
23
              THE COURT: Do you ever go to Walmart?
24
              THE JUROR:
                          When I have to.
25
              THE COURT: Not frequently?
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: We end up going probably once a month.
 2
              THE COURT: Okay. And what kind of products,
 3
    without being nosey, do you buy there?
 4
              THE JUROR: Mostly groceries. My wife looks at
 5
    groceries, I look at the firearms and ammo.
 6
              THE COURT: Right. And do you go to the Elizabeth
 7
    City store?
 8
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
 9
              THE COURT: You don't go to any other ones?
10
              THE JUROR: I have.
11
              THE COURT: Have you ever purchased a grill, a
12
    cooking grill, like charcoal grill or gas grill?
13
              THE JUROR: No, I haven't.
              THE COURT: You have not.
14
15
              THE JUROR: No, sir.
              THE COURT: You don't have one at home?
16
17
              THE JUROR: I do have a grill that's homemade.
              THE COURT: You made it?
18
19
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. So have you ever bought other
21
    products at Walmart that are outdoor products like chairs,
22
    umbrellas, plant tables, things like that?
23
              THE JUROR: Bought some umbrellas.
24
              THE COURT:
                         You what?
25
              THE JUROR: We purchased some umbrellas.
```

```
1
               THE COURT:
                          Umbrellas.
 2
                          Outside umbrellas, yes, sir.
               THE JUROR:
 3
               THE COURT: And have you shopped at Roses at all?
 4
               THE JUROR:
                          I have.
 5
                           There's one in Edenton down on 32.
               THE COURT:
 6
               THE JUROR:
                           Yes, sir.
 7
               THE COURT: And is that the one that you've been
 8
    to?
 9
               THE JUROR:
                           It is.
10
               THE COURT: What do you buy when you go to Roses?
11
               THE JUROR:
                           Bleach.
12
               THE COURT:
                           Bleach?
13
               THE JUROR:
                          Bleach.
14
               THE COURT: So you don't care about the brand, do
15
    you?
16
               THE JUROR:
                           Cheapest one, sir. Use it for
17
    cleaning.
18
               THE COURT:
                           And do you go to Roses other places or
19
    just the one in Edenton?
20
               THE JUROR: Pretty much the one in Edenton.
21
               THE COURT: So you made your own grill?
22
                          Yes, sir.
               THE JUROR:
23
               THE COURT:
                           Is it a gas or charcoal?
24
               THE JUROR:
                          Charcoal and wood.
25
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: You're welcome.
              THE COURT: Ms. Nixon, where are you from?
 2
 3
              THE JUROR: Town of Hertford.
 4
              THE COURT: What do you do for a living?
 5
               THE JUROR: Director of technology for Perquimans
 6
    County School System.
 7
               THE COURT:
                         And have you ever shopped at Walmart?
 8
              THE JUROR: Yes.
              THE COURT: And again, I identified the ones in
 9
10
    this area. Is that where you shop?
11
              THE JUROR: Yes.
12
              THE COURT: Mostly in Elizabeth City?
13
               THE JUROR: Yes.
14
              THE COURT: Have you ever been to any other Walmart
15
    besides Elizabeth City?
               THE JUROR: Yes.
16
17
               THE COURT: Okay. Have you ever bought a grill
18
    product at Walmart?
19
               THE JUROR: I don't think I purchased it at
20
    Walmart.
21
               THE COURT: But you have purchased a grill product,
22
    either charcoal or wood or gas?
23
               THE JUROR: Gas.
24
               THE COURT: Which one was it?
25
               THE JUROR: Gas.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: And where did you buy that?
2
              THE JUROR: One from a local store in Perquimans
3
    County.
 4
              THE COURT: Like hardware store kind of thing?
5
              THE JUROR: At a Tar Heel fireplace store. And
6
    Lowe's was the other place.
7
              THE COURT:
                         Say that --
8
              THE JUROR: Lowe's.
9
              THE COURT: Lowe's?
10
              THE JUROR: Um-hum.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. And with either of those
12
    purchases -- so you don't have a charcoal grill, you have a
13
    gas grill.
              THE JUROR: Correct.
14
15
              THE COURT: So with either them, was the brand name
    -- like I'm just thinking out loud in my experience, I know
16
17
    Weber is like a national name and I think Char-Grill is a
18
    popular name if you're looking for reliability or something
19
    like that. If you're trying to buy something, you know what
20
    it is as opposed to a generic name. So would that matter to
21
    you?
22
              THE JUROR:
                           Yes.
              THE COURT: The brand name?
23
24
              THE JUROR:
                          Um-hum.
25
              THE COURT: Did you actually buy a brand name?
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: I did.
 2
              THE COURT: What did you buy?
 3
               THE JUROR: I bought a Weber Holland grill.
 4
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. And those would be a little bit
 5
    upscale from the bottom-level grill?
 6
               THE JUROR:
                           Yes.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                  Thank you.
 8
              Hello, Mr. Twiddy.
 9
              THE JUROR: Good morning, sir.
10
               THE COURT: Where are you from and what do you do?
11
               THE JUROR: Dare County. Kitty Hawk. And I work
12
    in the property management business.
13
               THE COURT:
                           Real estate?
14
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
15
              THE COURT:
                          Are you with a company?
16
              THE JUROR:
                           I am the president of Twiddy & Company.
17
                          And is there a Walmart on the beach?
              THE COURT:
18
              THE JUROR:
                           There is, yes, sir, at Kitty Hawk.
19
               THE COURT:
                          In one of the shopping centers?
               THE JUROR: Yes, sir. Right as you come across the
20
21
    bridge on the right.
22
                           Oh, okay. So is it the anchor for that
               THE COURT:
23
    shopping center?
24
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes, sir.
25
               THE COURT: As you come across Powells Point and --
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: Come across Currituck Bridge, go to the
2
    second stop light and make a right. Harris Teeter, Home
3
    Depot and Walmart.
 4
              THE COURT: The golf course is on the left? Or the
5
    school is on the left?
 6
              THE JUROR:
                         Golf course on the left, school on the
7
    left, Walmart on the right.
8
              THE COURT:
                         And do you shop there?
9
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
10
              THE COURT: Okay. You go every day, every week,
11
    every month?
12
              THE JUROR: Probably once a month as needed.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. And typically are there some
    things you buy there or do you buy everything there?
14
15
              THE JUROR:
                         A little bit of everything, but
16
    certainly groceries, and I have bought outdoor things there
17
    in the past. Things like grill tools I have not bought --
18
              THE COURT:
                         Things like what?
19
              THE JUROR: Things like grill tools or outdoor
20
    material. Ammunition, things like that. Never bought a
21
    grill there.
22
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. Do you own a grill?
23
              THE JUROR:
                         Yes, sir.
24
              THE COURT:
                          And gas or --
25
              THE JUROR: I like to grill so I have a charcoal
```

```
1
    grill, a Wilmington grill, which is a gas grill, and believe
 2
    it or not I actually have a wood smoker as well.
 3
              THE COURT: And you bought those at specialty
    places or --
 4
 5
              THE JUROR:
                         All spots. Specialty places,
 6
    Kellogg's, and I bought the smoker at Lowe's.
 7
              THE COURT: Kellogg is a hardware store, isn't it?
 8
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir. Kellogg's.
 9
              THE COURT: And Lowe's is on the beach, too?
10
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
11
              THE COURT:
                           Would you ever consider going to either
12
    Roses or Walmart to buy a gas grill?
13
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
              THE COURT: You would?
14
15
              THE JUROR: I would.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. What would you look for there, a
17
    brand name or generic?
18
              THE JUROR: I would look for a brand name and I'd
19
    look for good construction.
20
              THE COURT: Is buying a grill sort of more than
21
    just a casual thing, is it like you invest more interest in
22
    it because of what -- the use you're going to put it to?
23
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
24
                          Would you spend more money buying it
              THE COURT:
25
    for yourself than buying it for like an organization or your
```

```
1
    shop or something like that?
                           I know I enjoy it, so I'm much more
 2
               THE JUROR:
 3
    likely to invest in things I enjoy. So to answer your
 4
    question, yes, sir.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay. And is there a Roses on the
 6
    beach?
 7
               THE JUROR:
                           There is not. Closest Roses I'm aware
 8
    of, there's one in Williamson and one in Plymouth.
 9
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. Thank you very much.
10
               THE JUROR:
                           Thank you.
11
              THE COURT:
                          Ms. Carr, where are you from?
12
              THE JUROR:
                         Plymouth.
13
              THE COURT: And what do you do for a living?
14
              THE JUROR: I am a cashier at Speedway.
15
              THE COURT: Speedway is a gas station and
    convenience store?
16
17
               THE JUROR: Yes; um-hum.
18
               THE COURT: And there's one on 64 bypass in
19
    Plymouth, is that where you work?
20
               THE JUROR: No, I'm in the middle. The one that's
21
    in the middle.
22
               THE COURT: Okay. But you sell cigarettes, candy,
    items, things like that. You don't sell hardware like -- do
23
24
    you have grills there?
25
               THE JUROR: No.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: No, okay. And do you ever shop at
 2
    Walmart?
 3
              THE JUROR: Yes. All the time.
 4
              THE COURT: So you probably go back to Williamson
 5
    to Walmart?
 6
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
 7
              THE COURT: That would be the closest one to go
    back on 64.
 8
 9
              THE JUROR: Yes. Um-hum.
                                          Yes.
10
              THE COURT: And what do you buy there?
11
              THE JUROR: Groceries, different stuff, personal
12
    items.
              THE COURT: Do you ever buy shoes, clothing, things
13
14
    like that?
15
              THE JUROR: No, not shoes, but clothes.
16
              THE COURT: Do you ever buy hardware or appliances
    there, like radios, clocks, grills, things like that?
17
18
              THE JUROR: I think I bought a heater there.
19
              THE COURT: A heater?
20
              THE JUROR: Yeah, um-hum.
21
              THE COURT: Okay. And do you shop at Roses?
22
              THE JUROR: Yes.
23
              THE COURT: Is there a Roses in Plymouth?
24
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
              THE COURT: Okay. So is that like if you needed
25
```

```
1
    something quick, would you go to the Roses instead of the
2
    Walmart?
3
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 4
               THE COURT: You feel like you get the same
5
    experience going to one or the other, it's just a question of
    where you are and how quickly you need to get it?
6
7
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
8
               THE COURT: Is that -- I mean, is that accurate for
9
    you?
10
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
11
               THE COURT: And when you're shopping in either
12
    Walmart or Roses, do you compare the prices and look at what
13
    the models are or is the price the main thing that you're
    looking for?
14
15
               THE JUROR: No, I'm actually looking at how it's
16
    made.
17
                          All right. Thank you.
               THE COURT:
18
              Hello, Mr. Grogan.
19
               THE JUROR:
                           Hi.
20
              THE COURT: Where do you live?
21
              THE JUROR: In Moyock.
22
              THE COURT:
                          And have you lived there a long time?
23
              THE JUROR:
                           12 years.
24
               THE COURT:
                           Where did you live before that?
25
               THE JUROR: Philadelphia.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: And so if you're in Moyock, you might
2
    go to Virginia to Walmart or Roses?
3
               THE JUROR:
                          Correct.
 4
              THE COURT: Do you ever do that?
5
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
 6
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                  I'm not familiar with the
7
    Tidewater area as much as here. So how close are you to
8
    Walmart where you live?
9
               THE JUROR: 20 minutes up in Chesapeake.
10
              THE COURT: It's in Chesapeake?
11
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes, sir.
12
              THE COURT: Chesapeake's on the other side of the
13
    line from Moyock?
14
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
15
              THE COURT:
                          And you own a grill?
                           Yes.
16
              THE JUROR:
17
                           Charcoal or wood or --
              THE COURT:
18
              THE JUROR:
                           Charcoal.
19
              THE COURT:
                           Charcoal. You don't have a gas grill?
20
              THE JUROR:
                          No.
21
              THE COURT: And how often do you buy a grill, when
22
    they wear out or --
23
               THE JUROR: Once every ten years maybe.
24
               THE COURT:
                          And so is it a substantial grill, like
25
    does it have a hood on it or --
```

```
1
              THE JUROR:
                          No. It's maybe 24 inches in diameter.
 2
              THE COURT: And is it a brand name?
 3
              THE JUROR: It's a Weber.
 4
              THE COURT:
                           Okay. So where did you buy that?
 5
              THE JUROR:
                          Home Depot.
 6
              THE COURT:
                           Okay. Home Depot is like a Lowe's kind
 7
    of place, isn't it?
 8
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
 9
              THE COURT: I don't personally go to Home Depot
10
    because I don't know where it is. There may be one around
11
    here, but I would go to Lowe's. But they sell -- they go
12
    head to head with Lowe's sort of?
13
              THE JUROR: Correct.
              THE COURT: And without being nosey again, what did
14
    the Weber grill cost, like 60 bucks or 70 bucks?
15
16
              THE JUROR: No. It was about $24.
17
              THE COURT: Okay. So it's not one that you
18
    expected to use a lot or keep for a long time?
19
              THE JUROR:
                           No.
20
              THE COURT: Occasional use if you want to cook
21
    hamburgers or hot dogs --
22
              THE JUROR: Correct.
23
              THE COURT: -- something like that.
                                                    Tell me about
24
    your contact with Walmart. How often do you go there?
25
              THE JUROR: We shop there probably once a week for
```

```
1
    groceries.
2
              THE COURT: So is it your primary grocery store?
 3
              THE JUROR: Correct.
 4
              THE COURT: And they have -- again, I'm not that
5
    familiar with it, but they have a grocery section that's
 6
    pretty big and then they have all the other things that you
7
    could go to Walmart for. Do you stick with groceries or --
8
              THE JUROR: I might buy some fishing equipment
9
    there once in awhile.
10
              THE COURT: They have all kinds of departments.
11
    Sporting goods, apparel, clothes, furnishings. So you
12
    basically do groceries and if you need something
13
    recreationally --
14
              THE JUROR: Correct.
15
              THE COURT: -- you might go there. Does it matter
    to you when you're shopping there what the brand says?
16
17
    mean, just curious. Are you looking for something that is an
18
    identifiable brand that you know and see advertised and have
19
    bought over the course of your life or are you looking for a
20
    price point and sort of weighing in the --
21
              THE JUROR: My wife works at Home Depot, so when an
22
    item goes on sale, I'll take advantage of it. And it's
23
    really a price decision.
24
              THE COURT: Okay. Price decision to buy at
25
    Walmart.
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: No, Home Depot because it was on sale.
 2
              THE COURT: Yeah. You're getting the best deal in
 3
    your experience at Home Depot because you're an insider
 4
    there.
 5
              THE JUROR: Correct.
 6
              THE COURT: So what would cause you to buy
 7
    something at Walmart; that they didn't have it at Home Depot?
 8
              THE JUROR: Depends what it was.
 9
              THE COURT: I'm going to come back to Mr. Mizelle
10
    in a minute but...
11
              Any of you own stock, shares of stock like on the
12
    Stock Exchange, in Walmart?
13
                           (No hands raised)
              THE COURT: Okay. I don't think Roses is -- or
14
15
    Variety is a traded company, is it?
16
              MR. ADAMS: No, it's not, your Honor.
17
    privately owned.
              THE COURT: But Walmart is on the big board, right?
18
19
              MR. PUZELLA: Correct, your Honor.
20
              THE COURT: Have any of you ever worked inside at a
21
    Walmart? Been an employee of Walmart?
22
                        (One juror hand raised)
              THE COURT: I'll have -- Mr. Niethamer.
23
24
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir. I worked for Sam's Club in
25
    Chesapeake probably 25 years ago.
```

```
THE COURT: How long did you work there?
 1
 2
              THE JUROR: Probably six months.
 3
              THE COURT: And what did you do?
 4
               THE JUROR: I was just a maintenance man. I had
 5
    retired from the Navy, and I was in between jobs before I
 6
    went back to work for the Navy.
 7
               THE COURT: Anyone else work for Walmart or one of
 8
    its affiliates?
 9
                           (No hands raised)
10
               THE COURT: Has anybody worked at a Roses or any of
11
    the other outlets that Variety Wholesalers owns?
12
                           (No hands raised)
13
               THE COURT: Have you worked at any job in that
14
    market area, retail, like Lowe's or -- your wife's at Home
15
    Depot. Anybody have any experience working in those
16
    settings?
17
                           (No hands raised)
18
               THE COURT:
                          Mr. Mizelle, where are you from?
19
               THE JUROR: I'm from Windsor, Bertie County.
20
              THE COURT: And what did you do for work?
21
              THE JUROR: Building inspector for Hertford County.
22
              THE COURT: So Windsor is your office?
23
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes, sir.
              THE COURT:
24
                          And do you ever go to Walmart?
25
               THE JUROR: Yes, sir. Twice a month.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Where do you go?
 2
                          The Williamston or Ahoskie.
               THE JUROR:
 3
               THE COURT:
                          There's a Walmart in Ahoskie, too?
 4
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
 5
                           What kind of products do you buy there?
               THE COURT:
 6
               THE JUROR:
                           Groceries and personal products and
 7
    maybe a few apparel.
 8
               THE COURT:
                          Do you own a grill?
 9
               THE JUROR:
                           I do.
10
               THE COURT:
                           Is it gas or charcoal?
11
               THE JUROR:
                           It's gas.
12
               THE COURT:
                          And where did you buy that?
13
               THE JUROR:
                           It was a gift and it's --
14
               THE COURT:
                          Someone gave it to you?
15
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
                           Is it a branded --
16
               THE COURT:
17
               THE JUROR:
                           I believe it's Char-Broil. Broil
18
    Charcoal (sic).
19
               THE COURT: Char-Grill?
20
               THE JUROR: Char-Grill maybe.
21
               THE COURT:
                          Char-Grill is like the char and
22
    a hyphen and the grill. It's got a silver hood.
               THE JUROR: I believe that's what it is.
23
24
               THE COURT:
                          Have you ever bought a grill yourself?
25
               THE JUROR: I have not. They're gifted to me most
```

```
1
    of the time.
 2
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
 3
              Let's see. You're Ms. Cahoon?
 4
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
 5
                          And where do you live?
              THE COURT:
 6
              THE JUROR:
                          Columbia, Tyrrel County.
 7
               THE COURT: And what do you do for a living?
 8
               THE JUROR: I work for Cherry Farm Seed.
 9
    package soybean and wheat seed.
10
               THE COURT:
                           Big outfit.
                           It is.
11
              THE JUROR:
12
              THE COURT: Amazing. What kind of seed, soybean
13
    and what else?
14
              THE JUROR: Soybean and wheat.
15
               THE COURT: Wheat seeds. Do they sell any other
16
    seeds?
17
                          No, not at this time. At one time they
               THE JUROR:
18
    did, but not anymore.
19
               THE COURT: And how do you measure it, by the
20
    pounds or bushels?
21
               THE JUROR:
                          By bushels, right. And then when we
22
    package it, we package it by seed count and it has to be like
    140,000 seeds per unit.
23
24
               THE COURT: A unit is a bag?
25
               THE JUROR: It can be a bag. It's kind of --
```

```
1
              THE COURT: Tell me how many -- how much do they
 2
           They sell nationwide, don't they?
 3
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes. We package seeds for a lot of
 4
    different companies, Monsanto, CPS -- which just changed
 5
    their names -- Remington. A lot of different companies.
 6
              THE COURT: Are the seeds all coming from the local
 7
    area or are you raising them all over the country?
              THE JUROR: A lot of them are coming from our area,
 8
 9
    yep. All the way from -- we have some growers down in South
10
    Carolina.
11
              THE COURT: So you sell to middlemen who are
    distributors and they sell to farmers?
12
13
              THE JUROR: Right. We, like, contract with the
14
    growers and get them to grow the seed, and then once at
15
    harvest, then the companies come in and, like, buy it and
16
    then tell us how they want it packaged and we package it.
17
              THE COURT: So the closest Walmart for you is in
18
    Little Washington maybe or --
19
              THE JUROR: Elizabeth City.
20
              THE COURT: Elizabeth City. Okay.
                                                  Not
21
    Williamston, or you don't go to Williamston?
22
              THE JUROR: Just don't go that way too much.
23
              THE COURT: You come up this way?
24
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
25
              THE COURT: Do you shop ever at Walmart?
```

```
THE JUROR: I do shop at Walmart.
1
2
              THE COURT: How frequently?
 3
              THE JUROR: Maybe a couple times a month.
 4
              THE COURT:
                          And what kind of products do you buy?
5
              THE JUROR:
                          A little bit of everything.
 6
              THE COURT:
                         Have you ever -- do you own a grill?
 7
              THE JUROR: I do.
8
              THE COURT:
                         Is it a gas or charcoal grill?
9
              THE JUROR: Charcoal.
10
              THE COURT: Where did you buy that?
11
              THE JUROR:
                         Walmart.
12
              THE COURT: Okay. And without being nosey again,
    about what did you pay for it, like $20, $40, $80?
13
14
              THE JUROR: I can't really remember, but I think it
15
    was like maybe around 40. It was just one of those little
16
    small ones. Little round Weber. (Indicating).
17
              THE COURT: It's a Weber?
18
              THE JUROR:
                         It is.
19
              THE COURT: But you bought it at Walmart?
20
              THE JUROR: I believe so.
21
              THE COURT: Okay. And you buy charcoal and use it
22
    for -- to cook that way when you barbecue?
23
              THE JUROR: Um-hum.
24
                         Okay. Do you ever shop at Roses?
              THE COURT:
25
              THE JUROR:
                         Yes.
```

```
THE COURT:
                          Where do you shop at Roses, in Edenton?
1
2
              THE JUROR:
                          Edenton and Plymouth sometimes --
 3
              THE COURT: There's a Roses in Plymouth, too.
 4
              THE JUROR: Um-hum.
5
               THE COURT:
                           And what do you buy at Roses?
 6
               THE JUROR: I bought a chair one time. I bought
7
    plants, potting plants. A little bit of everything.
8
               THE COURT:
                           If you were going to buy a grill, would
9
    you go to Roses or Walmart again?
10
                           I'd probably go to Walmart.
               THE JUROR:
11
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
12
              Ms. Wilson, where are you from?
13
               THE JUROR: Elizabeth City.
14
              THE COURT: And what do you do for a living?
15
              THE JUROR: I'm a nurse.
                           And what kind of a nurse?
16
              THE COURT:
17
                           I'm an intensive care unit nurse.
              THE JUROR:
18
              THE COURT:
                          At the hospital?
19
               THE JUROR: Chesapeake Regional.
20
              THE COURT: So you commute back and forth?
21
              THE JUROR: I do, yeah.
22
               THE COURT:
                          And are you -- you're a registered
23
    nurse?
24
               THE JUROR:
                          I am a registered nurse, yes.
25
               THE COURT: Do you ever shop at Walmart?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR: I do, yeah.
               THE COURT: And what do you buy?
 2
 3
               THE JUROR: Everything. Food, clothes.
 4
    Everything.
 5
               THE COURT:
                           Are you married or single?
 6
               THE JUROR:
                           I am married.
 7
               THE COURT:
                          Do you have a grill at home?
 8
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
 9
               THE COURT:
                          No. You don't have anything that will
10
    let you cook outdoors?
                           Huh-uh.
11
               THE JUROR:
12
               THE COURT:
                          Have you ever looked at buying a grill?
13
               THE JUROR:
                          No.
14
               THE COURT: And have you ever shopped at Roses?
15
               THE JUROR: I have.
                           Where do you go to Roses?
16
               THE COURT:
17
               THE JUROR: Food, mostly food. Where?
                                                       Where?
    Elizabeth City.
18
19
               THE COURT: Where is the Roses -- it's over at the
20
    mall?
21
               THE JUROR:
                          Yeah.
                                  Isn't there a Roses in Elizabeth
22
    City?
23
               THE COURT:
                          Yeah.
                                  There used to be one years ago.
24
               THE JUROR:
                          Yeah.
25
               THE COURT: At Southgate Mall.
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: Um-hum.
 2
              THE COURT: And what do you buy there?
 3
              THE JUROR: Food.
 4
              THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
 5
              Mr. Neithamer, you said you were in the Navy?
 6
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes, sir, retired. I retired from the
 7
    Navy.
 8
              THE COURT:
                          Where do you live now?
 9
              THE JUROR: In Andlett. In Currituck County.
10
              THE COURT:
                         And you worked at a Sam's for awhile?
              THE JUROR: For six months.
11
12
                          Shortly. Do you ever go to Walmart
              THE COURT:
13
    now?
14
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir, I do.
15
                          Where do you go?
              THE COURT:
16
               THE JUROR: We go to the one in Kitty Hawk about
17
    twice a month, and when we go to Chesapeake, we go to the one
18
    in Edinburgh. It's a little area.
19
               THE COURT: In Chesapeake?
20
              THE JUROR: Edinburgh.
21
              THE COURT: In Chesapeake?
22
              THE JUROR:
                         Yes, sir.
23
              THE COURT:
                          What do you buy at --
24
              THE JUROR:
                          Groceries and pet supplies.
25
               THE COURT: Do you own a grill?
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: No, sir.
 2
              THE COURT: Ever owned a grill?
 3
              THE JUROR: I have. Charcoal.
 4
              THE COURT: And where did you get them, like
 5
    hardware stores, Lowe's, Home Depot?
 6
              THE JUROR: Probably Lowe's or Home Depot.
 7
              THE COURT: It's not an item that you're -- that's
 8
    essential to you?
 9
              THE JUROR: No, sir. I don't remember the last
10
    time I bought one so --
11
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
12
              Ms. Dent, where are you from?
13
              THE JUROR: Ahoskie, North Carolina.
14
              THE COURT: And what do you do for a living?
              THE JUROR: I'm a housewife.
15
16
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. And do you ever shop at Walmart?
17
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
18
                          Where do you go to the -- Ahoskie?
              THE COURT:
19
              THE JUROR: Ahoskie, yes.
20
              THE COURT: What do you shop for there?
21
              THE JUROR: Groceries. I eat a lot of vegetables,
22
    so I'm there twice a week. I mean, we buy clothes,
23
    sports-type clothes, workout clothes, that kind of stuff.
24
              THE COURT: Do you have a grill --
25
              THE JUROR: Yes.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: -- at home?
 2
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
 3
              THE COURT: Is it a charcoal or a gas grill?
 4
              THE JUROR: I have a gas and a charcoal. And a fry
    pot, too.
 5
 6
               THE COURT:
                          Are they brand names?
 7
               THE JUROR:
                         No.
 8
              THE COURT:
                         Where did you buy all those?
 9
              THE JUROR: Lowe's.
10
               THE COURT: At Lowe's, okay. So what's the -- is
11
    there any sort of trademark on the gas grill?
12
               THE JUROR: I really don't know. I just look more
13
    for durability, because I don't buy stuff like that very
14
    often so I want to make sure it's good quality stuff.
15
               THE COURT: You want it to last.
16
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
17
               THE COURT: Have you ever bought -- have you been
18
    to Roses ever?
19
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
20
                         Where do you go to Roses?
              THE COURT:
21
              THE JUROR:
                          Ahoskie.
22
                         There's a store there?
              THE COURT:
23
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
24
                          And what do you buy at Roses?
              THE COURT:
25
               THE JUROR: Casual clothes, stuff to hang on the
```

```
walls and personal items, hair stuff.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Would you ever consider buying a grill
 3
    at Roses?
 4
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
 5
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
 6
              Ms. Riche, where do you live?
 7
               THE JUROR:
                           We live in Carova on the Outer Banks.
 8
              THE COURT:
                          All the way up --
 9
              THE JUROR:
                          Just about.
10
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. Because the road stops
11
    somewhere, right?
12
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes, it does.
13
               THE COURT: It stops after the village or --
14
              THE JUROR: After the village, yes. Carova.
15
               THE COURT: And then you're on sand, you're on the
16
    Currituck Wildlife Refuge that everybody comes here if they
17
    get in trouble for. See, we have jurisdiction over all the
18
    national seashores and Park Service and Fish & Wildlife and
19
    that sort of thing. So it's always been a curiosity to me
20
    about the people who were above the paved road how they knew
21
    that they were going to get home because the ocean doesn't
22
    have a green light and red light on it.
23
               THE JUROR: That's correct. You have to watch the
24
    tides very carefully.
25
               THE COURT: Yeah, they got to drive on the hard
```

```
1
    pack, and sometimes the hard pack isn't there.
 2
                          That's correct.
               THE JUROR:
 3
               THE COURT: But how long have you lived up there?
 4
               THE JUROR: Five years.
 5
                           Okay. And so is a Walmart or Roses
               THE COURT:
 6
    accessible to you? You're sort of out of the way.
 7
                           The Walmart is about 15 miles or so.
               THE JUROR:
 8
               THE COURT:
                           Where is that, in Virginia?
 9
              THE JUROR: Kitty Hawk. The one and only.
10
              THE COURT: You come down highway 12 --
11
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
12
              THE COURT:
                          -- and you shop there?
13
              THE JUROR:
                          Once a month or so.
14
              THE COURT:
                          What do you get there?
15
               THE JUROR: Personal products, holiday stuff,
    craft-type stuff.
16
17
                           Have you ever bought a grill or outdoor
               THE COURT:
18
    equipment there?
19
               THE JUROR:
                          Not there, no.
20
                          Where would you buy them?
              THE COURT:
21
              THE JUROR: We bought our grill from Lowe's.
22
               THE COURT: And how about a Variety or Roses, do
23
    you ever shop there?
24
               THE JUROR:
                                I don't even know where one would
                          No.
25
    be. Yeah.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: So to your knowledge, you've never been
 2
    in a Roses?
 3
              THE JUROR: Correct.
 4
               THE COURT: Mr. Harmon -- I'm sorry, Ms. Bond,
 5
    where are you from, ma'am?
 6
               THE JUROR: Windsor, North Carolina.
 7
               THE COURT: And what do you do for a living?
 8
              THE JUROR: I'm a fraud investigator for Bertie
 9
    County.
10
              THE COURT: Social services?
11
              THE JUROR:
                          Yes, sir.
12
              THE COURT:
                          And do you ever shop at Walmart?
13
               THE JUROR: Yes, I do.
14
              THE COURT: Where do you go, to Ahoskie or
15
    Williamston?
               THE JUROR: I've been to Ahoskie, but the one I go
16
17
    to the most is Williamston.
18
              THE COURT: That's the closest one for you?
19
              THE JUROR: Yes.
20
              THE COURT: How often do you go?
21
              THE JUROR: About once a month -- once every
22
    two months.
23
               THE COURT: What do you buy when you go to Walmart?
24
              THE JUROR: Just various things. Mostly I'm
25
    looking for a deal.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: Yeah. Do you ever buy hardware
 2
    products like a grill or chairs or tables or outdoor
 3
    merchandise?
 4
              THE JUROR: I have bought a grill from there.
                                                              It's
 5
    been several years ago.
 6
              THE COURT: From -- you bought a grill at Walmart?
 7
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
              THE COURT: Was it charcoal or gas?
 8
 9
              THE JUROR: It was charcoal.
10
              THE COURT: And do you remember what it was called,
11
    what the brand was?
12
              THE JUROR: It was on sale for 20 bucks.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. So it was a small one, not a
14
    hood -- it was one that you take the top off -- it had a
15
    hood?
              THE JUROR: No. Just take the top off and set it
16
17
    here.
18
              THE COURT: Put the charcoal in, put the lighter
19
    fluid in and there you are.
20
              THE JUROR: Yes.
21
              THE COURT: How about Roses, do you shop there at
22
    all?
23
              THE JUROR: I go there also.
24
              THE COURT:
                         Do you go to one more than the other?
25
              THE JUROR: No. I mean, I'm just -- when I go, I
```

```
1
    have specific things in mind for a deal, and if it's in my
2
    category of how much money I want to spend, then that's where
3
    I end up buying something from.
 4
              THE COURT: Do you go other places like the Dollar
5
    Store and Dollar General?
 6
              THE JUROR: Yes. I go there also for the same
7
    reason, for that set amount of money that I want to spend.
8
              THE COURT:
                           Okay. Thank you.
9
              Mr. Harmon, where do you live?
10
              THE JUROR: Windsor.
11
              THE COURT: And what do you do for a living?
12
              THE JUROR: Drive a log truck and I run the loader
13
    for Ray Bateman in Edenton.
14
              THE COURT:
                          Run a what?
15
              THE JUROR: I drive a truck and run the loader for
16
    Ray Bateman out of Edenton.
17
              THE COURT: What's the last thing you said, out of
18
             Ray Bateman?
    Edenton?
19
              THE JUROR: Yes.
20
              THE COURT: He's a logger.
21
              THE JUROR: He's a logger, yes. I run the loader
22
    for him and drive the truck for him.
23
              THE COURT: So the loader is a stationary piece of
24
    equipment that puts the logs on the truck?
25
              THE JUROR: Yes.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: Then you're also able to drive the
 2
    truck?
 3
              THE JUROR:
                         Yes.
 4
              THE COURT: And you work in the log woods 50 miles
 5
    around this area.
 6
              THE JUROR: Working for James, you work everywhere.
 7
              THE COURT: How far do you go? Do you go down to
 8
    Little Washington or below that?
 9
              THE JUROR: We go back up towards Jackson,
10
    Wellville, places like that.
11
              THE COURT: And where do you unload the logs?
12
              THE JUROR: Usually Ahoskie.
              THE COURT: Warehouses there?
13
              THE JUROR: No. That's in Greenville.
14
15
              THE COURT: What's that?
              THE JUROR: In Greenville.
16
17
              THE COURT: And do you ever go to Walmart?
18
              THE JUROR: Yes. About once a month, something
19
    like that.
20
              THE COURT: And what do you buy there?
21
              THE JUROR: Just what I need. When I go in the
22
    store I know what I'm getting. I go there, I don't shop
23
    around, I just go get what I need.
24
              THE COURT: Do you own a grill?
25
              THE JUROR: Yes.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: What kind of grill, gas --
 2
               THE JUROR: It's a Master Grill, a charcoal grill.
 3
               THE COURT: Is that the name, Master Grill?
 4
               THE JUROR: Yeah.
 5
               THE COURT:
                          Where did you buy that?
 6
               THE JUROR: My neighbor gave it to me, bought it
 7
    from Lowe's.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 9
               Have any of you ever been a juror in a case where
10
    it was a civil or criminal case?
11
                       (No affirmative response)
12
               THE COURT: State or federal court?
13
                       (Two juror hands raised)
14
               THE JUROR: I have, too.
15
               THE COURT: Ms. Dent, where was that?
16
               THE JUROR: Winton, North Carolina.
17
               THE COURT: In Hertford County.
18
               THE JUROR:
                          Um-hum.
19
               THE COURT:
                           What kind of case was it?
20
               THE JUROR: It was a murder case.
21
               THE COURT: A murder?
22
               THE JUROR: A murder case, um-hum.
23
               THE COURT: That wouldn't affect you in this case,
24
    would it?
25
               THE JUROR:
                           No.
```

```
1
              THE COURT:
                         How about you, Ms. Cahoon?
2
              THE JUROR: I served as a juror in Terrell County
3
    on a DWI case.
 4
              THE COURT: Raise your hand if you have a college
5
    degree.
 6
                   (Jurors responding affirmatively)
 7
              THE COURT: Keep your hands up. One, two, three,
8
    four, five. Okay. Raise your hand if you have a
9
    postgraduate college degree or education.
10
                   (Jurors responding affirmatively)
11
              THE COURT: One, two. Okay.
12
              Raise your hand -- obviously not the people who
13
    have college degrees, but if you didn't raise your hand for
14
    that, if you have a high school diploma.
15
                   (Jurors responding affirmatively)
16
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. Thank you very much.
              Let me see the lawyers from each side up here.
17
                           BENCH CONFERENCE
18
19
                            (On the Record)
20
              MS. GARKO: Good morning, your Honor.
21
              THE COURT:
                          I'm just telling you you're going to
    get three strikes on each side. And the way mechanically
22
23
    it's done is you have the odd numbers one, three and five and
24
    you have two, four and six. What we'll have left, if it
25
    works as planned, are eight jurors and that will be your
```

trial jury.

MR. ADAMS: And, your Honor, do we say this out loud or do we bring a piece of paper up to you --

THE COURT: You do it here quietly so that no one knows who struck who.

MR. ADAMS: Okay.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Conclusion of Bench Conference)

(Open Court)

THE COURT: Take as much time as you need.

Any of you been in this room before? It's been here since 1903. I haven't been here since 1903. Almost. And the main post office in Elizabeth City was downstairs, but the Postal Service closed that about 15 years ago or 12 years ago and they have a much less impressive building on Ehringhaus Street. That's the post office.

But this used to be the business center of the community. Everybody came here to get their boxes, their mail and deliver mail, and upstairs was this room -- I've been here since 1984. That guy up there on the corner was here from 1925 to '45. Between '45 and '84 there wasn't any judge here. Still had judges, but there weren't that many.

This guy up here, he was appointed by Thomas

Jefferson and he served for 55 years, and he was the only

United States judge in North Carolina for 55 years. The

whole state. So there wasn't a lot to do.

These guys -- that guy over there, he was from Elizabeth City. He served from 1865 to 1882 and he was the only judge in the state. Then around the 1870s, the Congress created two districts for North Carolina. So there was a judge in the west and a judge in the east. I can't imagine how they traveled. I guess they had a railroad and ferry boats and things like that, but...

There's still only three judges now. I'm here and there's one in Raleigh and one in New Bern. And there's a retired judge in Greenville and another one in Raleigh. Most of what we do is criminal trials, although every now and then there's a civil trial like this, but criminal trials you have to do them in a short amount of time. There's a constitutional requirement that you have a speedy trial and so that takes precedence over most other things.

MS. GARKO: Your Honor, may I approach with a request about the process briefly?

THE COURT: You want to approach?

MS. GARKO: Yes, your Honor.

## BENCH CONFERENCE

(On the Record)

MS. GARKO: If we elect not to use all of our peremptory challenges, will you seat more than eight jurors or are you only intending to seat eight jurors?

```
1
              THE COURT: That presents the choice on my part
 2
    that I might take yours off for you. I wouldn't risk doing
 3
    that.
 4
              MS. GARKO: Okay. So it will just be whatever
 5
    number it ends up being if they aren't all used.
 6
              THE COURT: The whole idea -- not to give you a
 7
    tutorial. You don't need it, you're all good lawyers, but
    there's bound to be someone left who you think is less
 8
 9
    favorable than someone else. That it's well known that the
10
    jury selection is you're taking the people you can't try the
11
    case to off. You're not looking for friends, you're avoiding
12
    enemies.
13
              MS. GARKO: I understand, your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: So --
15
              MS. GARKO: We wanted to understand the outcome if
16
    we used two challenges instead of all three.
17
              THE COURT: I'm intending to try it to eight
18
    people.
19
              MS. GARKO: Okay.
20
              THE COURT: So why give to me the strike when you
21
    can keep it for yourself.
22
              MS. GARKO: Okay. Thank you. We wanted to
23
    understand it.
24
              MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, I did have one question.
25
    There's a couple of additional questions we would like to
```

```
1
    ask.
2
              THE COURT: About what?
 3
              MR. ADAMS: Can we bring them up to you? Basically
    we would like to know if any of the jurors have relatives
 4
5
    that work for either Roses --
 6
              THE COURT: That's a good question. I'll ask that.
7
              MR. ADAMS: Also there was one question about Ms.
8
    Cahoon who worked for the soybean company. We would like to
9
    know if her company owns any trademarks.
10
              THE COURT: Okay. Yes. I'll definitely ask that.
11
              MS. GARKO: Thank you, your Honor.
                   (Conclusion of Bench Conference)
12
13
                              (Open Court)
14
              THE COURT:
                          Do any of you have family members or
15
    people that you're connected to in some way who are employees
16
    of either Walmart or Roses? Like, does your husband or your
17
    child work at one of those stores or have they worked there
18
    in the past? Yes, sir, Mr. Grogan.
19
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir. My children worked there
    when they went through college.
20
2.1
              THE COURT: Worked at Walmart?
22
              THE JUROR: Yes, sir.
23
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. And how long ago was that?
24
              THE JUROR: At least 20 years ago.
25
              THE COURT: Okay. What did they do?
```

```
1
              THE JUROR: One daughter worked in the vision
 2
    center and the other was just a clerk.
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. And where were these stores?
 4
              THE JUROR: Pennsylvania.
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else have any family
 6
    experience? Ms. Bond.
 7
              THE JUROR:
                         My son -- he was in college and the one
 8
    in Greensboro. One of the ones in Greensboro.
 9
              THE COURT: What did he do there?
10
              THE JUROR: Cashier.
11
              THE COURT: He was at a Walmart?
12
              THE JUROR: Yes.
13
              THE COURT: Anyone else?
14
                       (No affirmative response)
15
              THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Cahoon, your company,
    how long did you say you worked for them?
16
17
              THE JUROR: Four years.
18
              THE COURT:
                          Four years.
19
               Do they sell products to purchasers under a brand
20
           Do they have a trademark or a brand name?
    name?
21
              THE JUROR: They have -- Cherry Farms has their own
22
    seed.
23
              THE COURT: Cherry Farms.
24
              THE JUROR:
                         Right.
25
              THE COURT: C-H-E-R-Y?
```

```
1
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes. They have their own wheat.
 2
                          Their own brand that --
               THE COURT:
 3
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 4
               THE COURT: It's packaged and marketed with their
 5
    label on it?
 6
               THE JUROR:
                          Yes.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. And Cherry is an actual physical
    place in that part of the world and it's also a name. I
 8
 9
    mean, your last name might be Cherry.
10
               THE JUROR:
                           Right. The man who -- his last name is
11
    Cherry who started Cherry Farms.
12
               THE COURT: But there's also a place in Terrell or
13
    Washington.
14
               THE JUROR: Washington County.
15
               THE COURT: Called Cherry.
16
               THE JUROR: Correct.
17
                           It's a little village, crossroads.
               THE COURT:
18
               THE JUROR:
                           Correct.
19
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
20
                          We're ready, your Honor.
              MR. ADAMS:
21
               THE COURT:
                          Are you ready?
22
               MS. GARKO: We are, your Honor.
23
                           BENCH CONFERENCE
24
                            (On the Record)
25
               THE COURT:
                          All right. There are no challenges for
```

```
1
    cause that the Court has found, so the first strike is with
2
    the plaintiff.
3
              MR. ADAMS: The plaintiff will strike number two,
 4
    Mr. Grogan.
5
              THE COURT: Defendant.
 6
              MS. GARKO: Defendant strikes number three.
 7
              THE COURT: Three?
8
              MS. GARKO: (Nodding head).
9
              THE COURT: You're next.
10
              MR. ADAMS: Oh. Actually, I misunderstood. I
11
    thought we would go back after the first pair and then come
12
    back.
13
              THE COURT: So I said you had one, three and five.
14
    If you want a moment to go back --
15
              MR. ADAMS: Let me get my chart.
              THE COURT:
16
                          Yes.
17
       (Attorneys Adams and Garko returned to counsel table to
18
                  confer with counsel off the record)
19
              THE COURT: Have any of you ever owned, either
20
    personally or in your family or business, a trademark? Have
21
    you ever had -- gone through the process of registering a
    federal trademark?
22
23
                       (No affirmative response)
24
              THE COURT: All right.
25
          (Attorneys Adams and Garko returning to the bench)
```

```
1
              THE COURT: Your turn.
 2
              MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff strikes number three, Mr.
 3
    Twiddy.
 4
              THE COURT: Which one?
 5
              THE JUROR: Mr. Twiddy. Three.
 6
               THE COURT: I didn't get it again. Four -- point
 7
    to it.
 8
     (Attorney Adams pointing to juror number three, Mr. Twiddy,
 9
                      on the jury panel sheet)
10
              MS. GARKO:
                          Juror number ten.
11
              THE COURT: Who is your last --
12
              MR. ADAMS: Ms. Gunia, number seven.
              MS. GARKO: Number nine.
13
              THE COURT: Wilson?
14
15
              MS. GARKO: Yes.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
17
                    (Conclusion of Bench Conference)
18
                              (Open Court)
19
               THE COURT:
                           The following persons are excused.
20
    Don't get up yet. You can be processed out after we take a
21
    recess.
22
              Mr. Grogan, Ms. Carr, Mr. Twiddy, Ms. Gunia, Mr.
    Neithamer and Ms. Wilson. You're excused and don't have to
23
24
    return. Thank you for being here and thank you for your
25
    service.
```

The other jurors are also going to be excused. The people whose names I didn't call will be taken to the jury room and when you come back in you'll be sworn and we'll begin the opening statements and the trial. We'll be in recess at this point.

(Recess at 11:17 a.m. to 11:33 a.m.)

(Open Court)

(No jury present)

THE COURT: It's my opinion that the Fourth

Circuit's ruling makes binding five of the nine factors in

determining likelihood of confusion and that -- let's see.

They found that three, four, five, eight and nine favored the

plaintiff; that there is an issue of fact on one, two, six

and seven. And that will be the law of the case in terms of

this trial.

And I'm not going to submit an issue of damages or have evidence on damages because I spent a lot of time on damages and the Fourth Circuit reversed on the question of fact on liability. So I'm convinced that the appropriate way to handle this is to try the liability issue, stop, let you go to the Fourth Circuit, whichever way it goes, they're going to want to rule on it again, and then come back.

And I think that the equitable disgorging of profits that I ruled on wasn't reversed by the Fourth Circuit, but it wasn't affirmed by the Fourth Circuit. And

as a matter of judicial economy and -- I would hold that that is still binding if the plaintiff wins. If the plaintiff loses and the Fourth Circuit affirms that, then it's all gone.

So I don't know if you expected this, but that's the way I'm inclined to try the case and present it to the jury. It will be a more compact and manageable case and these jurors, you've seen them, they'll give you whatever the right answer is.

MR. PUZELLA: Your Honor, I understand your ruling. I'm not challenging it. I just would like to make the record clear.

THE COURT: Absolutely. Because you'll be reading it in the red room in Richmond.

MR. PUZELLA: Exactly. Walmart's position is that the Fourth Circuit vacated the entire summary judgment order. Each of the elements in the likelihood of confusion test were a part of that opinion that was reversed and this trial should address all of the likelihood of confusion elements in part not just because of the vacation of the order, but because the elements require a weighing of one another and there's no indication in the Fourth Circuit opinion as to the degree to which particular elements weigh in favor of the plaintiff or in favor of the defendant. So the jury is going to be hamstrung in their ability to weigh the nine factors.

It's not as simple as a factor is in plaintiff's favor versus in defendant's favor because of Variety at issue three.

So our view is that the entire case should be put on likelihood of confusion.

And then with respect to damages, arguing similarly that every order following the summary judgment order was also vacated and as a result, this trial ought to consider those issues as well. But I understand the Court's order. I just wanted to have the record reflect our position.

THE COURT: Well, even if you're correct about the damage issue, I'm going to bifurcate it and we'll try the liability only here. It's wasteful any way you cut it to try damages and then have it reversed in the Court of Appeals.

How about the plaintiff?

MR. ADAMS: May I, your Honor?

Obviously, I disagree with Walmart. The Fourth Circuit was very clear. They used the word "waive" expressly so really no need to discuss that. I'm not sure I understood your Honor correctly though about damages, which of course involves both the disgorgement of the profits issue and the more formal damage issue, which in our case is the seeking of a reasonable royalty. Am I correct that this is strictly just going to be on liability?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ADAMS: You're not going to re-enter or enter a

```
1
    further judgment on the disgorgement issue again?
 2
                                I mean, the only way we get to
              THE COURT:
                           No.
 3
    damages here without going through the Fourth Circuit is for
 4
    both sides to come to some agreement after a jury verdict.
 5
                           I understand. I just wanted to make
              MR. ADAMS:
 6
           We're using the term "damages." You were using it in
 7
    the sense of profits disgorgement and the more formal damages
 8
    type. So that's fine.
 9
              THE COURT: I'm not going to paint myself into a
10
    corner. I'm not sure that I agree with that, but I do agree
11
    that damages are not going to be presented to the jury in
12
    this case.
13
              MR. PUZELLA: Your Honor, just so we're clear,
14
    we're only addressing liability, the question of a likelihood
15
    of confusion between the two parties' products.
16
              THE COURT:
                         Yes.
17
              MR. PUZELLA: Does that include in the Court's
18
    judgment the issue of causation?
19
              THE COURT:
                           What does that mean?
20
              MR. PUZELLA: The issue of whether Walmart's use of
21
    Backyard Grill caused any harm to Variety or there's a link
22
    between the use of Backyard Grill by Walmart in its sales.
    Is that in this trial or out of this trial?
23
24
              THE COURT: I'm sorry to be simple. Give me that
25
    again.
```

```
1
              MR. PUZELLA: Sure. So I conceptualize there being
2
    three issues in a trademark case. There's the question of
3
    liability, which typically includes whether the mark is
 4
    valid.
5
                         What are we trying to --
              THE COURT:
 6
              MR. PUZELLA: I just want to understand what we're
7
    doing, that's all.
8
              THE COURT: So do I.
9
              MR. PUZELLA: Right. I conceptualize a trademark
10
    case as having three main parts. One, on the liability side,
11
    whether the marks are valid and whether they've been
12
    infringed.
13
              THE COURT: Well, one of the marks is
14
    incontestable.
15
              MR. PUZELLA: Correct. And two that they also
16
    claim are not registered, and our position is they're
17
    descriptive and plaintiff has the burden of showing secondary
18
    meaning in order for them to be protectable. So there's the
19
    issue of validity and the issue of likelihood of confusion.
20
    That's liability. I understand your Honor to say that that
21
    is in this case now and for present purposes.
22
              Next --
23
              THE COURT: The protected one is The Backyard.
24
              MR. PUZELLA: Correct. For lawn and garden
25
    equipment.
```

THE COURT: Correct. The other two are The Backyard and Backyard Barbecue.

MR. PUZELLA: I understand their position to be Backyard standing alone and Backyard BBQ.

THE COURT: So three iterations of it.

MR. PUZELLA: Correct.

THE COURT: The Backyard, Backyard, and Backyard Barbecue are, according to the plaintiff, protected by use but not by registration.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.\ \operatorname{PUZELLA}:$$  The first by registration, the second two by use.

MR. ADAMS: I can answer for the plaintiff, your Honor. Our position has been consistent from day one. And this is consistent with the Fourth Circuit's law going back to <u>Lone Star</u> and <u>Synergistic</u>. In the Fourth Circuit, the scope of a trademark registration is not limited to just the literal words in the registration and the literal limitations of the goods and services description. Whether you're talking about it in terms of a shadow -- a halo or something, that that's exactly what the Fourth Circuit has said on numerous occasions.

So it is not the case, it is not the case that this case has two sets of trademarks, one that's registered and thereby protected and the other that's simply common law and therefore we're required to show some type of secondary

meaning. I think we can do that anyway, but before we go down that road we need to take a careful look at Lone Star and <u>Synergistic</u> and some of the other case law. The defendant is just dead flat wrong on that issue.

Mention and that is that Walmart has stipulated that our trademark registration is valid. That's a stipulation that's not in controversy here. Secondly, there's an issue of willfulness. And that's going to have to be a separate issue to the jury because that will depend substantially on the type of relief that's afforded and the standard by which the Court determines what that relief is.

If your Honor wants to bifurcate the trial, that's fine with us. It was going to be -- there was going to be an appeal anyway so --

everything. I mean, that's the nature of the beast, and it's just as confusing and indefinite as it can be, and so what are we doing here? I mean, you know, you want me to give summary judgment again and you can race back to Richmond and get it flipped? I'm looking for closure and neither of you appear to be interested in closure.

MR. PUZELLA: Your Honor, I'm interested in closure. My only question before we got on the side road was what's in. We're ready to go. If it's just liability and

validity, that's the case we'll put on. We're happy to do that. I only ask whether causation is in this trial or not. If it's not, it's not. I understand you to have said that damages are not.

MR. ADAMS: The issue I have is the issue with validity.

MR. PUZELLA: And I think I can clarify that.

MR. ADAMS: Validity is not in this case. They've stipulated that our trademark registration is valid and the case law in the Fourth Circuit is quite clear that the --

THE COURT: If I can't understand what you're doing, how do you expect these eight people who went to the tenth grade to understand it? I mean, this trial is just in vain.

MR. PUZELLA: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: It's a lottery.

MR. PUZELLA: I think we're talking past each other. Walmart does not challenge that Variety's trademark registration for lawn and garden equipment is valid. We stipulated to as much. But Variety claims two other common law marks. If they would like to abandon those and only present the case on the registered mark we can do that. But to the extent they claim two other marks, they need to prove ownership in those two other marks. It's plaintiff's choice.

MR. ADAMS: If Mr. Puzella is right, we've been

using those other two marks since 1993, so that's not in controversy either.

MR. PUZELLA: Yes, it is, your Honor.

MR. ADAMS: We're here to try the case your Honor wants to try.

THE COURT: I don't want to try a case at all. And my frustration is going to be communicated to the jurors.

And so you'll end up with the case reversed and sent back again. I've had this happen. And it's not pretty. And, I mean, your billing goes up because it goes into perpetuity and you both have deep-pocket clients so they don't care.

And I mean, go back and look at the *Georgia-Pacific* trademark case that went up and down and up and down and up and down and they ended up with the Supreme Court litigators at the last end. You know, we can do that. We can do that.

Okay. We'll bring the jury in.

MR. HOSP: Your Honor, if I may, there are a couple of issues that I think we may put out in the opening that we have motions on. In particular, there's a privilege issue where -- it's my understanding that the plaintiff intends to ask questions directed deliberately to try to force Walmart to assert a privilege. We don't believe that's appropriate. I raise it now in particular only because it's my understanding based on the slides that we've gotten and the presentation that we understand is going to be delivered in

the opening that there's actually going to be an excerpt of a transcript --

THE COURT: Oh, yeah, and I'm going to impose time limits on the trial. I'm thinking of how to do that. Like two days for each side. And it can be done. I mean, you can take it up. You can try to mandamus me in the middle of the trial, whatever. The prospect of this taking on a life of its own is not something I want to be a part of.

MR. HOSP: Yes, your Honor.

MR. PUZELLA: Your Honor, if the case is just liability we can do that in two days. No problem.

THE COURT: Okay. I mean, I'm not going to -- like if you're really doing a great job, I'm going to shut up and get out of your way. But if this is rope-a-dope where everybody's in there just to drag it out and take minor concessions, then I'm going to start talking to the jury and you'll end up with a bad outcome for everyone.

So don't worry about it. Just -- you made all your motions and I've denied them all. We'll see how it goes.

I'm just going to be part of the audience and -- anyway.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, may I make a suggestion.

This may be true for Walmart as well. In view of your

Honor's order, I'm going to need to revise my opening

statement somewhat, so I'm suggesting maybe we break for

lunch now and let us do that during lunch and then come back.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything to move it along.

No, here's what we're going to do. Bring the jury in, swear the jury in, give my preliminary instructions and then send them to lunch and you can come back at 1:30 and start.

Bring the jury in.

(Jury panel in at 11:51 a.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Swear the jury.

THE CLERK: Please stand and raise your right hand.

(Jury panel sworn by the deputy clerk)

(All jurors respond affirmatively)

THE CLERK: Thank you. You may be seated.

## PRELIMINARY JURY INSTRUCTIONS

(by The Court)

Ladies and gentlemen, you've been sworn as the jury in this case. I'll give you some preliminary instructions to guide you in your participation during the trial.

It will be your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You and you alone are the judges of the facts. You will then have to apply those facts to the law. The Court will give you instructions on the law. You have to follow the law whether you agree with it or not.

Nothing that I say or do during the course of the trial is intended to indicate, nor should it be taken by you as indicating what your verdict should be. The evidence from which you will find the facts will consist of the testimony

of witnesses, documents and other things received into the record as exhibits, and any facts that the lawyers agree or stipulate to or that the Court instructs you to find.

Certain things are not evidence and should not be considered by you. I'll list these for you. First the statements, arguments and questions by the lawyers are not the evidence in the case. Objections to questions are not evidence. Lawyers have an obligation to their client to make an objection when they believe evidence is being offered that is not admissible under the Rules of Evidence. You should not be influenced by the objection or by the Court's ruling on it. If the objection is sustained, ignore the question. If it's overruled, treat the answer as you would any other.

If you are instructed that some item of evidence is received for a limited purpose only, you have to follow that instruction. Testimony that the Court has excluded or tells you to disregard is not evidence and must not be considered. Finally, anything you have seen or heard outside of the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence presented here in court.

Generally speaking, there are two kinds of evidence, direct evidence and circumstantial evidence.

Direct evidence is proof of a fact such as the testimony of an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is proof of facts

from which you may infer or conclude that other facts exist.

I will give you further instructions on these as well as other matters at the end of the case, but bear in mind that you may consider both kinds of evidence.

It will be up to you to decide which witnesses you believe and which witnesses you do not believe and how much of any witness's testimony you accept or reject. I'll give you guidelines for determining the credibility of witnesses at the end of the case.

This is a civil case. The plaintiff in the case, Variety, has the burden of proving its case by what is called a preponderance of the evidence. That means that the plaintiff has to prove evidence which, when considered in light of all the facts, leads you to believe that what the plaintiff claims is more likely true than not true. To put it differently, if you were to put plaintiff and defendant's evidence on opposite sides of the scale, plaintiff would have to make the scale tip somewhat to its side. If the plaintiff fails to meet this burden, the verdict must be for the defendant.

If you have been aware of criminal cases, you will have heard that the standard of proof there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That requirement does not apply to a civil case and should be put out of your consideration in this case.

In this case, the plaintiff claims that the plaintiff has trademarks that are protectable and that there is a likelihood of confusion in the defendant's marketing of products using trademarks that the plaintiff claims interfere or impinge on its trademark. You will hear a great deal about this during the case and I will give you instructions on the rules of law at the end of the case.

During the trial you're not to discuss the case with anyone or permit anyone to discuss it with you. Until you retire to your jury room at the end of the case to deliberate on your verdict, you're not to talk about the case. Don't read or listen to anything about the case in any way. If anyone tries to talk to you about it, bring it to the attention of one of the court officials and they'll bring it to my attention.

Do not try to do any research or make any investigation about the case on your own.

And finally, you're not to form any conclusive opinion until all of the evidence has been received. Keep an open mind until you start your deliberations at the end of the case.

If you want to make notes, you can. If you do, they're for your own personal use. Leave them in the jury room when you're away. Remember these are not to be shown or given to anyone.

```
The trial will begin after our lunch recess. Each side at the beginning may make an opening statement. This opening statement is neither evidence nor is it an argument. It's an outline of what that side of the trial intends to prove. It's offered to help you follow the evidence.

After the opening statements the plaintiff will present witnesses and the defendant may cross-examine these. The defendant will then present witnesses if it so chooses
```

to arrive at a verdict.

That's an outline of how a federal civil jury trial will develop and I think if you pay attention, you'll see it

instructions on the law. You will then go to your jury room

and the plaintiff may in turn cross-examine these. After all

of the evidence has been presented, the attorneys will appear

before you and make their closing arguments to summarize and

interpret the evidence for you and I will give you

At this point, we will recess for lunch until 1:20 and come back then and begin the opening statements. Court will be in recess for that time.

(Lunch recess at 11:50 a.m. to 1:25 p.m.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

The jury can be with the plaintiff for opening.

24 ///

2.1

follow that course.

25 ///

## OPENING STATEMENT

(By Mr. Adams)

Good afternoon. My name is Thad Adams, and I have the privilege of representing the plaintiff in this case. I would like to briefly introduce to you the other members of the team. Ms. Christina Trimmer, Mr. Scott Shaw, Mr. Alex Long and a paralegal, Ms. Cecelia Sidebottom, will be here in just a few short minutes.

This case is about Walmart's dishonesty and arrogance in stealing valuable property that belonged to the plaintiff in this case, Roses Stores, now owned by Variety Stores. This valuable property is Variety's Backyard trademark. So this case is about trademarks, as you heard your Honor say, and it should be an easy one for you because you are all trademark experts.

By that, I simply mean that probably before you were able to read or write, you could point to the Tony the Tiger and tell your parents that you wanted Frosted Flakes, or the silly bird on the Fruit Loops, that you wanted Fruit Loops. As you got older, you may have started using trademarks to purchase particular brands of clothing and shoes. And so there are trademarks that you're exposed to every day. Some people prefer Coca-Cola to Pepsi. Beechnut to Wrigley. Exxon to Mobil. Crest or Colgate. All these choices require that you use trademarks. And you certainly

used the Walmart or Roses trademarks to determine where you shop based on the answers that you gave his Honor just a little while ago.

So Kellogg or Post cereal. Ford or Buick automobiles. Apple or Microsoft computers or smart phones. Hanes or Jockey T-shirts. McDonald's or Wendy's hamburgers. Imagine how difficult it would be if everything was sold in a plain white box so that the only thing you saw on the box was cornflakes or cereal or hamburger or just whatever the case may be.

The purpose of the trademark is to tell you where the product came from; in other words, who's standing good for this product that I'm paying my money for. And it works in two different ways, because a trademark allows you to pick and choose things that you like so that you can go back the next time and buy the same product, but they also serve a reverse purpose. If you don't like a product, the trademark gives you the privilege of making sure the next time you go back to purchase toothpaste or whatever it may be, you don't buy that product.

So trademarks really serve two purposes. First, they protect the investment the company makes in creating a unique way of identifying a product. So you can imagine how important is it that the company owns Crest for toothpaste. That brand has been around for 40, 50, maybe 60 years. That

obviously is a very important asset of the company.

And just as importantly, as I mentioned a moment ago, the trademark allows a customer to locate and select a specific brand of the product that she wants -- he or she wants to buy or doesn't want to buy.

You're exposed to a little R with a circle around it or a little TM dozens of times every day whether you notice it or not. Maybe after this trial you'll be noticing it more often. But those little circle Rs and little TMs, they mean something. They mean that the owner of the trademark is telling everyone to keep off. The R in the circle means that the trademark has been registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office and only the trademark owner has a right to use that circle R. Exactly the way Variety did it. They have a circle R on their trademark.

Which brings us to the facts of this case. The dishonest, the willfully dishonest, deliberately dishonest way that Walmart has dealt with Variety's Backyard trademark. We have here a gentleman sitting just behind the rail who has worked with and for Variety Stores and Roses for decades. He was there when Roses created and registered The Backyard trademark. That gentleman is Mr. Tim Blackburn from Henderson, North Carolina, where Roses is located. He's the vice-president and general counsel of Variety Stores and its

Roses Stores subsidiary. And he will tell you with complete truthfulness how Walmart stole Roses' Backyard trademark.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Roses Stores, this was back before it was acquired by Variety, adopted and registered The Backyard trademark way back in 1993 as the trademark identifier originally for a department, a particular department in its store. Blackburn saw that Variety and Roses followed the law. filed registration papers with the U.S. Government and the trademark office which examined, approved, and then granted a trademark certificate which you'll see during this trial that extends Variety's trademark protection throughout the entire United States. And it was so successful that Backyard very quickly became a trademark that's also applied to a wide variety of products sold only by Variety's Roses Stores. And just by way of one example, you see here on the left is a Roses grill. And on the right you see virtually the identical grill that is -- was sold in -- by Walmart. cases, the prominent aspect of the trademark is Backyard.

So Roses over a period of time expanded the use of its trademark to barbecue grills and accessories, patio tables and chairs, garden hoses, sprinklers, a whole host of things, umbrellas, and The Backyard trademark was prominently placed on these products -- all of these products to tell the public that Variety's Roses Stores owns The Backyard trademark. And this is one easy part of this case. Walmart

admits that Variety owns The Backyard trademark and that it's valid. It's not going to be an issue that you'll have to determine.

So Roses uses the circle R that I mentioned a few moments ago to advise the public of its trademark rights.

Variety's Roses Stores use the investment in The Backyard trademark to sell many millions of dollars of grills and other products. It developed a good reputation over the years. So much so that some years ago another company wrote Roses and said we would like to buy your trademark. We like The Backyard trademark; we would like to buy it. Roses said no, thank you, and unlike Walmart, the other company did not go ahead and steal it anyway. They backed off.

More recently another company started using the trademark Backyard Traditions on barbecue grills, an infringement of Roses' Backyard trademark. Roses objected, the other infringer agreed to stop. And you'll hear Mr. Blackburn give testimony about those transactions and some others.

So in 2010 along comes Walmart. Walmart wanted to have its own brand of private label grills and accessories. It had been using a trademark called Mainstays,

M-A-I-N-S-T-A-Y-S, on some grill-related products and wanted to change to a better trademark. So under the millions of possible trademarks that Walmart could have chosen, it chose

Backyard Barbecue as well as some others to consider for its new line of grills. Variety had been using Backyard Barbecue for many years. Walmart has refused to say where it got the idea for using The Backyard trademark. I doubt you'll hear that answer during this trial.

Walmart went to a huge amount of effort, many lawyers, a large brand team, several very expensive surveys, focus groups, brainstorming sessions, trademark searches, evaluations. This must have cost a huge amount of money and these searches turned up The Backyard trademark owned by Variety. So Walmart has known about Variety's Backyard trademark since the very beginning, long before it sold the first product branded with The Backyard trademark -- and Walmart admits this. Again, this is not in dispute.

Variety's Backyard trademark ranked high in Walmart's evaluation. Some of these surveys I just mentioned. Much higher than the Mainstays trademark that it had been using. And we know a few things about how Walmart decided to use The Backyard as its trademark. We know that Walmart's legal team made Walmart's brand team aware of Roses Backyard trademark. We also know that after at least two of these discussions Walmart decided not to use Backyard. Of course, in the end we know that Walmart used Roses' trademark anyway.

There are some things we don't know about Walmart's

decision to steal Roses' Backyard trademark, but nevertheless this is an easy case. This is not like a TV show. This is not like Matlock where you have two totally conflicting stories being told by the witnesses on the stand and Matlock or someone finally breaks down one of the witnesses and he confesses or she confesses and the whole thing is settled.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In this case, the relevant facts in this case are about Walmart's willful infringement, and these are Walmart's facts. Walmart's decision to ignore Variety's Backyard trademark and registration. Walmart's decision to use Backyard even after hearing twice not to use it, after discussions with their lawyers. Walmart's admission that it did not -- this is important. I'll start over again. Walmart's admission that it did not trouble itself to send anybody to even one Roses store to see how Roses was actually using its Backyard trademark. Not one person. Even though as you -- I'm sure you know from the questions, there are many Walmart stores and many Roses Stores that are very close together. It would have been a simple matter to send an assistant manager from a Walmart store down to Roses with the question, hey, check out their home section and let us know if they have any products that have their Backyard trademark Simple 30-minute trip from one end of Elizabeth on them. City to the other and back.

Here's another important fact. Walmart's decision to continue and even greatly increase its willful illegal use of Variety's Backyard trademark even after we found out about it and objected. And in fact, you'll learn from Mr. Blackburn that most of Walmart's infringing sales took place after we raised the objection that they were infringing our trademark.

This is going to blow you away. Walmart has sold almost 1 billion -- that's billion with a B -- infringements, in dollar value infringements of Roses' trademark. A billion dollars. And that's just over a four-year period. And again, this is not in dispute.

So Walmart is going to have at least ten witnesses here to try to explain to you why it should not be found guilty of trademark infringement. And what you're going to hear from Walmart from all of their witnesses are excuses. Excuses made up after the fact, after Walmart was found out and then they had to come up with something.

So let's match up some of Walmart's excuses with the actual facts that you're going to hear from Walmart's own witnesses. Remember, this is Walmart's evidence by and large you're going to be hearing. Of course you'll hear Mr. Blackburn tell about the history of The Backyard trademark from Roses' standpoint, but the relevant facts in this case are really the facts you'll hear from Walmart's witnesses.

So Walmart's going to tell you that they adopted and used The Backyard trademark in good faith. No. Walmart adopted and used Variety's Backyard trademark after they had discussions with their lawyers and the existence of The Backyard trademark had been brought to their attention.

Walmart didn't know -- this is another excuse -Walmart didn't know Variety was using Backyard on products
such as grills. No. Walmart learned about Variety's
trademark from its trademark lawyers long before it decided
to use it. The fact that Variety used its Backyard trademark
on various products like you see here is a matter of public
record in the trademark office. Anyone who troubled
themselves, and I'm sure Walmart's attorneys did, to go to
the trademark office and look in the public files would see
evidence of many products that Variety and Roses have been
using on its products.

You'll also hear -- well, you probably will. I'm not so sure after the jury was selected, but you're going to hear -- you may hear that Variety is not a competitor of Walmart; in other words, that Walmart's business and Roses' business are unrelated to each other; that even if there were products both bearing the same trademark, that there would be no likelihood of confusion because their businesses are so separate and apart and -- that can't possibly be believed based on Walmart's own evidence. In fact, you'll hear a

Walmart witness testify that Variety is a competitor of Walmart. And as I've said earlier, many of Variety's stores and Walmart stores are very close together. So it's not surprising that someone might walk into a Walmart, for example, and see a Backyard grill and maybe a day or two later walk into a Roses or a Maxway and see a Backyard grill and wonder, well, same or not?

Walmart is going to tell you that The Backyard trademark has no value; that it's really not any good. This is what I call sour grapes. No again. Think about and listen to the evidence of the very expensive effort that Walmart went to in picking and choosing among the various several trademarks that they could have chosen and then they finally ended up choosing Backyard. A Walmart witness will testify that the Backyard trademark fitted well with its customers; that Walmart filed -- they even filed their own trademark application to register Backyard as a trademark and just for the same services and products just like Roses did. So on the one hand Walmart is saying not even a trademark, no good, but yet they turn around and file a trademark application in the trademark office and tell the trademark office this is our trademark.

The value of The Backyard trademark is also demonstrated by an offer by a third party to license or purchase The Backyard trademark from Variety and there have

been two other infringers, both of whom when they were contacted by Roses or Variety voluntarily stopped. So we didn't have to go through this exercise. All of these facts establish the value of the trademark Backyard.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Then Walmart's next excuse is, well, Walmart's trademark is not really Backyard; it's really the word grill. Now, we know that's silly. Grill simply defines the product, right? That's what it is. It doesn't serve to -- it can't serve as a trademark because it's simply descriptive. Anyone who wants to sell grills can call it a grill, right, because that's a descriptive term, just like anybody who wants to sell toothpaste can call it toothpaste. You might put a name like Crest or Colgate or Arm & Hammer or something in front of it. That's the trademark. But toothpaste is the descriptive term and grill is the descriptive term, and here Backyard is the trademark and BBQ on Roses' is the descriptive term. And on Walmart's, Backyard is the trademark and the word "grill" tells you what it is. It's a grill.

And then Walmart is going to finally -- they're going to tell you that no one has been confused by Walmart's infringing use of Backyard. This won't trouble you I don't think at all. The right question is, and you'll hear his Honor tell you this, the question is whether there is a likelihood of confusion. We don't have to prove there has

been any actual confusion, but we're going to. The goods are the same, they're grills, and other accessories. They're all identical. Walmart's own paid experts conducted surveys, and despite a very one-sided effort to make those surveys show what Walmart wanted these surveys to show, in fact these surveys show a very substantial amount of actual confusion.

Now, there are other excuses that you will hear from Walmart, but the story of this case keeps coming back to Walmart's willful infringement. Willful. Walmart's infringement was not an accident. It happened deliberately. Walmart chose to steal Roses' Backyard trademark with full knowledge of all the important facts and because they figured more likely than not they would simply get away with it. It took The Backyard trademark and it used The Backyard trademark as its own trademark with full knowledge of Variety's prior rights, and you will be asked to determine whether Walmart's infringement was willful, deliberate, reckless, without regard to Variety's trademark rights. No doubt that is true.

As I said a few moments ago, this trial is
Walmart's story. Walmart stole Variety's Backyard trademark
knowing that it was Backyard Variety's (sic) trademark, and
when Walmart objected, Walmart said in so many words, shove
it. Walmart kept infringing, even vastly increased its
infringement after Backyard objected -- I'm sorry, after

Roses objected.

So you may very well decide that this is a case in which a larger company with deeper pockets for litigation selected a product name with the same dominant word as a smaller company by which to sell the same and similar items as that smaller company. The larger company knew of the smaller company's use and trademark when it decided to use the name, but the larger company used it anyway. The items were then sold in the same types of stores located in the same geographic areas and frequented by the same types of customers. It is difficult to imagine how these circumstances lead to anything but a likelihood of confusion.

Now, I'm going to sit down and let Walmart's attorney speak. He has a tough job. He's going to have to convince you that black is white, that wrong is right, that Walmart should walk away from this courtroom with your blessing. Walmart will try to explain away its willful infringement with the excuses that I've listed above and others. The facts in this case speak for themselves and they all speak in the plaintiff's favor. As I said, this is an easy case. Walmart stole Roses' Backyard trademark. Walmart used that stolen property to sell a billion dollars of infringing grills and many other related products with full knowledge of Roses' rights. Walmart did it deliberately, knowingly and willingly. That will be the end of Walmart's

story and the end of Walmart's case. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. The jury can be with the defendant for opening.

### **OPENING STATEMENT**

(by Mr. Puzella)

Good afternoon. My name's Mark Puzella and I represent Walmart. With me at counsel table is Sheryl Garko and David Hosp, two of my partners. And in addition, we have Dave Ortiz, who's a 30-year employee of Walmart. He's in charge of the outdoor products that are in issue in this case which includes the grills and grilling accessories. You'll hear from him later.

You all have a very important job to do. It's important because our system relies on citizens like you to decide disputes. You have to use your common sense and apply that common sense to what you hear in this courtroom. At the end of the trial, the Judge is going to instruct you on what the law is. What you're going to do is process the witnesses that you heard testify and the documents that were received and you're going to decide what the facts are. The facts are not what I say they are right now and they're not what Mr. Adams just said a moment ago. The facts are what you decide them a couple of days from now. You're going to decide those facts and you're going to apply them to the law and you're going to use your common sense. That's how we resolve

disputes, and Walmart is confident that when you apply your common sense to the facts that you hear, you will rule in our favor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ultimately you're going to have to decide two First, are there marks that are valid. So here on things. the screen -- hopefully behind me -- you can see the marks that Variety claims and they were discussed broadly by Mr. Adams a moment ago. On the left you see that one mark is registered. That means that it's on a public list, registered with the federal government, anyone can go look it up. And importantly, when you go look it up, you can see what the person who registered it claims the mark applies to. And you can see down here in yellow that Variety's The Backyard mark is registered for, quote, retail store services in the field of lawn and garden equipment and supplies, closed quote. What's missing there? The word grill and the word grill accessories. That's what's on the public record.

Now, on the right there are unregistered marks, or depending on the day, Variety just decides that they're a version of the registered mark. But the point is that there are other uses. You saw on the Backyard BBQ a few moments ago on the board there and standing alone Backyard, a claim that they use those for grills and grilling accessories. But those aren't registered. What's registered is retail store services in the field of lawn and garden supplies and

equipment. That's what the public record says.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Importantly, you will hear that for the unregistered uses or those uses on grills and grilling accessories, Variety did very little to make people aware of the fact that they actually used the words that way. Thev only used it on the products and in their circulars. The little flyers that they hand out or that are in the newspaper. They didn't use it in magazines, on the Internet, TV ads, and they certainly didn't register it as we just discussed.

And you're going to hear that a Variety witness, at the beginning of this case, didn't even know that The Backyard was used on grills. So what do we have? We have a use that's not registered, it's not on a public list, it's not advertised a lot, it's not widely known, and their own witnesses are uncertain about how they use it, yet you just heard Walmart was supposed to know all about those uses. You're going to apply your common sense and see if that's the case.

Now, once you decide what marks or mark are at issue, you need to decide the question of liability, and in a trademark case, that's whether there's a likelihood of confusion, whether people like you in the marketplace are going to see the two trademarks and be confused by them. That's it. That's not complicated. You guys can do that.

Importantly, you're going to hear what happened in the real world. You're going to hear that Walmart, as Mr. Adams just said, sold lots of products. What does that mean? There were lots of opportunities for shoppers to express confusion. To say something. To return a product to the wrong store. To call the wrong store and, I'm trying to assemble my grill and it's not going together right, what do I do. To complain because they're unhappy with the product.

You will hear that despite all of the products that were sold, not one, not one shopper said anything. There isn't a single instance of actual confusion in the real world. So if you're trying to decide the legal question of whether there is a likelihood of confusion, isn't the answer found in whether there's any actual confusion? That's what you're going to have to decide and that's the sort of common sense question you're going to have to apply.

You're also going to hear testimony from a Walmart -- that Walmart did not intend to infringe Variety's trademark. You're going to hear from Ms. Karen Dineen, a 30-year employee at Walmart who's the senior most marketing person in charge of this branding project. She will tell you that Walmart was aware of the mark on the left, the registered mark. Walmart was aware that Variety claimed to own Backyard for retail store services in the field of lawn and garden equipment and supplies. She will also tell you

that Walmart was not aware that Variety used it on grills. Walmart didn't know that at the time it adopted its mark and put it on its products. That is a very important distinction that, again, you need to filter into your common sense about whether there's an intent as Variety contends.

Another thing that you should consider in this mix is that the word backyard is not like Tony the Tiger, it's not like Crest, it's not like Nike, it's not like any of the examples that we just heard. The word backyard you will hear is widely used in the marketplace. In fact, Variety's own witness will tell you that backyard is widely used.

Behind me are all of the different federal trademark registrations that use the word Backyard. There are lots of them. And there are more than there are on this slide. Yet, Variety would like you to think that Backyard is Tony the Tiger or Crest or Nike. How many Tony the Tigers, Crests or Nikes are there? There's just one. There are lots of Backyards. So if you're trying to think through whether consumers are going to be confused by Walmart's use of Backyard Grill, you should think about how Backyard is actually used in the marketplace and the fact that lots of folks use it. Does that contribute to confusion? No. No one single company can own Backyard for these types of products.

Another thing that you will see over the course of

the next day or so are the actual products. You'll see that both parties use the word Backyard. That's what Variety's going to emphasize, but they're going to stop there. You shouldn't stop there. When you're considering how consumers look at marks in the marketplace, you need to look at the whole use, the whole mark. How is it used on the actual products and its packaging. What does it look like to the shopper on the shelf. It's not just do both companies use the same word, it's how does the whole thing look.

Now, Marvin Deshommes, another 30-year employee of Walmart, will tell you, along with Ms. Dineen, that Walmart never thought the word Backyard and the mark Backyard Grill was going to cause people to buy the products. Walmart did research with consumers before it chose the name in 2011. Before it knew about Variety's use on grills. You can see some that have research here. And here it's important for you to apply some discipline to the evidence that you hear. Mr. Adams said a moment ago that Walmart's excuses are made up after the fact. This document predates the company's knowledge of Variety's use of grill. This is internal Walmart research.

And you'll see in March 2011, Marvin Deshommes will tell you this, that, quote, grill names do not have a large impact on shoppers' decisions when cost features and benefits are the same. When shopping based on name alone, shoppers

will migrate towards well-known recognized names. Things like Weber. If Backyard Grill was the only available brand, shoppers are more likely to continue shopping than to make a purchase decision on the spot.

So Mr. Deshommes and Ms. Dineen knew that the word backyard wasn't going to be the thing that drove people to buy this product. They knew the thing that was going to drive people to buy the product was quality, price and features. So what did they do? They designed the packaging to accentuate that.

Here's a page from Walmart's brand manual. And you can see an example of the packaging and you can see that the packaging is not designed for the word backyard to be front and center. For the consumer to shop based on the presence of the word backyard. Why? Because lots of people use backyard. It's descriptive of the product. It's a backyard grill.

You can see here on the screen Backyard is small. Grill is large. The letter I is replaced by a picture of a grill. Unique logo that Variety doesn't use, and Variety doesn't use grill either. It's white on black. The name of the product and its features are bold and big in red. So when you have to think about whether there's a likelihood of confusion and thinking about what the shopper sees on the shelf in the store, they're seeing this. They're not seeing

Backyard and Backyard. They're seeing the whole thing. And that's what you should consider when assessing the likelihood of confusion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, another thing you're going to see over the course of the next couple of days are the parties' products. Here on the screen you'll see some of the products, and you'll see that the overall presentation of the parties' products is different. Walmart didn't steal Variety's mark. They look different. This isn't a case of knock-offs, this isn't a case of counterfeiting, this is a case of two companies using a very common word, backyard. You saw a few moments ago 30, 40 companies use it in the state. This isn't theft; this is a regular word applied to products as you would expect to see in the marketplace. And when you look at the products side by side, your common sense should tell you that Walmart just designed its products to feature the products, the name of what the thing is, whether it's gas grill, 17-piece premium barbecue set, or 60-inch grill cover. That's what's front and center.

You'll also hear from two different survey experts that opposing counsel mentioned, Hal Poret and George Mantis. Those survey experts tested whether there's a likelihood of confusion. They designed surveys to test that very question. They polled real consumers. People like you. Hundreds of them. One of them tested whether consumers were likely to

confuse Walmart's mark with Variety's mark and the other did the reverse, whether consumers are going to confuse Variety's mark with Walmart's mark.

You will hear from both experts, and they'll tell you that the results of their survey show that there's no likelihood of confusion. There's none. So what do we have? We have no real-world instances of actual confusion despite lots of sales. Not one person, not one shopper. We have the mere use of a word that lots of people use on these types of products and the overall design is different. And we have two survey experts who tested this issue and found no likelihood of confusion. You won't hear about surveys from Variety. They didn't do one. At least they didn't -- they're not going to present one. So you're only going to hear surveys from Walmart.

So at the end of the trial, we're going to ask you to apply your common sense. You're all shoppers, you're all experienced people in the world. Take in the evidence, weigh the facts, apply the law, and when you do that, Walmart's confident that you will rule in our favor. Thank you in advance for your attention. I look forward to talking to you over the next couple of days.

THE COURT: All right. The company with the stand, are you ready with your first witness?

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, the plaintiff calls Mr.

Blackburn.

### GEORGE TEMPLETON BLACKBURN II

having been duly sworn, testified as follows: THE WITNESS: I do.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. ADAMS:

- Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Blackburn. Would you state your name for the record, please.
  - A. I'm George Templeton Blackburn II.
  - Q. And Mr. Blackburn, where were you born and raised?
  - A. Henderson, North Carolina.
    - Q. And where do you live now?
    - A. Henderson, North Carolina.
- Q. And what is your occupation?
- A. I'm an attorney licensed to practice law in North Carolina, and I am currently senior vice-president and general counsel of Variety Wholesalers.
- Q. Mr. Blackburn, would you please tell the jury just a little bit about your educational background?
- A. I attended the public schools in Henderson, graduated from Henderson High School. Then I went to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill undergraduate, and then I attended the law school at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill and graduated in 1976.
- Q. Now, Mr. Blackburn, also give us just a short

summary of your employment history.

A. When I graduated and passed the bar in 1976, I went back to Henderson and joined the law firm of Perry, Kittrell, Blackburn & Blackburn. The two Blackburns were my father and my uncle, and Mr. Perry and Mr. Kittrell, they were first cousins with each other. And I worked with them and practiced -- I became lead counsel for Roses, outside counsel for Roses in 1984, still a member of the law firm.

Then in 1991 Roses asked me to come in-house as their first in-house counsel, and so I was employed by Roses Stores from 1991 until 1997, when Variety Wholesalers bought Roses Stores. So then I was employed by Variety Wholesalers first as its vice-president and general counsel and then as senior vice-president and general counsel.

- Q. So you worked in a law firm, you said you worked in-house with Roses and Variety. Can you explain the difference between an in-house attorney and an attorney who works in a law firm?
- A. Yes, and people do get confused about that. A lawyer practicing in a private law firm can represent any of a wide variety of clients, but when you're in-house counsel you only work for that one company. So I was exclusively working for those companies when I was employed by Roses Stores and Variety Wholesalers.
  - Q. So Mr. Blackburn, when you succeeded Mr. Kittrell

as lead attorney for Roses in 1984, what types of legal work were you responsible for on behalf of Roses?

- A. At that time Roses had no in-house general counsel, so I handled essentially the whole gamut of their legal requirements that they had and they were broad. It was employment law, profit-sharing trust for the employees, contract issues, trademarks, real estate, leases for their stores, and Securities and Exchange Commission filings because it was publicly held.
- Q. Now, you mentioned trademarks. What was your responsibility there?
- A. I first encountered trademarks for Roses early on in the late 1970s and so I was responsible for advising them about their trademarks, and I early on associated Mr. Adams' firm and Mr. Adams' firm has handled the detailed work for the trademarks for Roses Stores and then Variety Stores ever since the late 1970s.
- Q. And how, if at all, did your duties change once you began working in-house at Roses?
- A. They were the same basic duties as outside, but I had been particularly brought in-house because Roses had the need to work on financing agreements with its banks and I was brought in-house to be involved particularly in the negotiations that were taking place for financing Roses' inventory.

Q. Now, Mr. Blackburn, tell the jury something about the history of Roses Stores just briefly.

A. Roses was founded by Mr. Paul H. Rose, Paul Howard Rose. He was from Seaboard, North Carolina, which is a real small town about halfway between Elizabeth City and Henderson, where I live. He moved to Henderson in 1915, opened the store. It went bust. He bought out his two partners and reopened the store as a Roses store. And back then, you had -- the variety stores were very small and they were what you would call a five-and-dime store. His was a 5-cent, 10-cent, 25-cent store.

And he opened the first store there, then he opened a second store in Oxford, North Carolina, ten miles away. He put his brother, TB Rose, in charge of that, and then he opened two more stores in North Carolina and two in South Carolina. One in Franklin, Virginia, which is not very far from where we are right here.

And then they just started expanding from then on. They were very like the Woolworth's stores which had really invented the form of retail where you go in and actually get to look at the products. Before then everyone would go in a store and the products were on shelves going all the way up to the ceiling in plain boxes and the clerk would wait on you. But these were variety stores that you could go in and products were on the table and you could look at them and buy

them, and they were all right in the central business district of town. There were about 5,000 square feet and they sold a variety of things from candy, fresh popped corn, notions, things to sew with, toys -- we were famous for toys -- and clothing. All sorts of things were sold in those stores.

And that continued really that way, those were the way the stores were, until the 1960s. In the 1960s stores started moving out of the central business district and going to strip malls just outside of town because people were moving out to those areas, and so Roses also started developing stores in the strip malls.

Well, these were much larger stores. These would range anywhere from 25,000 to 70,000 was about the largest store that we had. And so they sold the same breadth of things, but they had many more types that you could buy -- different types of toothpaste and more types of cloth and notions and things like that.

And so at that time our chief competitor was no longer Woolworth's, it was K-Mart. We would go to a town, we were typically the store that would be what's called an anchor tenant when the shopping mall got opened or the shopping center. We would be one of the anchor tenants and the other -- a food store would join us and the other small retailers.

And then K-Mart, after we'd been there for awhile, K-Mart started moving in the area and they would build a store right opposite us or very near, because these were all towns about the size of Henderson and Elizabeth City.

They're about the same sized towns. And they would compete.

We'd have competition. For about two years our profits would be down and at the end of two years it would be back up and they would get better, and so that continued. That was the way retail was in our geographic area, which was really ten states and the southeast.

That was the way we operated and competed until the 1980s. We reached our peak profitability in the 1980s and then in the late '80s, Walmart changed the landscape in retail.

- Q. Let me ask you, Mr. Blackburn, what was Roses Stores' financial position in the 1990s?
- A. In the 1990s it became very difficult. In fact, that was why I was brought in-house as general counsel, to help work on the financing of the inventory. First the banks themselves got in trouble and that caused them to tighten up on credit, but the banks became worried about the future of retailers because there had been a number of retail companies that had gone under due to the competition with Walmart at the various places and they wanted to know what was -- how was Roses going to meet that competition, what were they

going to do to be able to survive against Walmart.

And it really was a different story because unlike when K-Mart moved next to us, their store might be 5,000 square feet more than ours but not significantly different. But Walmart would come in and build a store that was 80,000 or 90,000 square feet, and here we were in a shopping center with one store on one side and one store on the other and not much you can do. And of course the banks wanted to know how are you going to be able to compete with them, how are you going to be able to continue.

And so we had difficulty getting financing to continue operations. We had to seek Chapter 11 protection from -- in a bankruptcy and reorganize the company. We had to get rid of a number of our stores. We lost a lot of good employees. But we came out of Chapter 11, reorganized in 1995, and in 1997 we were purchased by Variety Wholesalers, which was a private company.

- Q. All right. Mr. Blackburn, at that time what was Roses' relative size? How many stores did it have in how many states?
- A. When we came out of Chapter 11 we had 106 stores and they were in ten states.
- Q. So what was your role with Variety Wholesalers after the purchase of Roses?
  - A. I handled the same type of matters for them that I

handled for Roses except with two major exceptions. I didn't have to be involved much in banking or finance. Variety
Wholesalers had operated very conservatively and had a very strong financial statement and large cash reserves and was able to provide stable financing to run the Roses Stores and the stores they already had, so I didn't have to be involved in that. And I didn't have to do any Securities and Exchange Commission filings, which was great relief to me --

Q. Now, Mr. --

- A. -- because they're not publicly held.
- Q. Excuse me. Now, Mr. Blackburn, I think his Honor may have mentioned there were several stores, the names of stores owned by the Variety Wholesalers. Would you just remind and tell the jury what they are?
- A. Well, Judge Boyle was correct. Eagles was one of those stores. Variety had expanded by buying small troubled companies and acquiring their stores over a long period of time. They had started back in the 1940s. And so they collected a large number -- a large variety of names like Pope's, which was the first stores, then Eagles, some Ben Franklin stores they had. They bought the Maxway Company that was based in Sanford, North Carolina. They bought Valumart.

Since I've been there they bought Bill's Dollar Stores. So they had a large number of names, but today the

names that are used are really Roses Stores and Roses Express and Maxway, and then we've got some of those others still left over that are in small stores in various places.

- Q. Mr. Blackburn, what kind of goods does Variety Stores sell now?
- A. The same variety of goods that we've always sold and it's anything from clothing to candy, health and beauty aids. Several of you said that you have shopped in our stores, so you know we sell the same types of things that Walmart sells. We don't have the same depth of merchandise that they have. We may not have the same variety of any given item, but we sell the same breadth of items they sell.
- Q. Mr. Blackburn, how many stores does Variety Wholesalers have now?
  - A. About 370 stores now.

- Q. And over what physical footprint?
- A. Well, there are 16 states plus the District of Columbia. And basically you go from Florida north to Pennsylvania, across to Indiana, down to Louisiana, back to Florida.
- Q. Mr. Blackburn, are all the Variety's customers in those 17 jurisdictions?
- A. No. We have stores in places like Virginia Beach;
  Norfolk, where you have military people coming in and out
  from all over the country. Vacation places, Virginia Beach

or Myrtle Beach or Orlando, Florida, where people can come from all over the country. And of course you have people who have family members visiting, coming back from where -- coming to visit people where our stores are located, and so our customers can be on any given day in a store from all over the United States literally.

- Q. So does Variety Wholesalers have any plans for expansion?
- A. We do. Up until now, all the stores for the company have been supplied from one distribution center in Henderson, but about a year ago, we opened a second distribution center just west of Atlanta in Newman, Georgia, which will enable us to expand towards the west and states north and west of there.
- Q. Now, Mr. Blackburn, you mentioned a few moments ago that your duties at Roses and now at Variety's include trademark matters; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. How many trademarks did Roses have before being purchased by Variety?
  - A. 21.

2.1

- Q. And what do you understand the role of Variety's trademarks to be?
- A. Well, really what they do is they identify our stores and our products to our company and the purpose of

them is to provide names, both on the stores and our products, that we can be known by and our customers won't be confused as to where the product came from or who we are. So the trademarks are very important to that.

- Q. Well, how are they important to the company's business?
- A. Well, the of course, the signs on the stores, the names of the stores are important so our customers can find us in the -- on the Internet or find where our stores are because they know the name, but also the product lines, our private label products, those have been developed with the idea that customers will grow to like them and know that you can only get those at a Roses store or a Maxway store and when they want to buy those products will come shop with us and hopefully not just buy those things but buy a whole lot more.
- Q. So does Variety own any trademarks for house brands for lines of merchandise that are manufactured for Variety and only for Variety?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Can you provide a few examples?
- A. Well, in the soft lines we have a name called Carolina Bay, and of course this lawsuit is about the mark we developed for our lawn and garden and grilling products which is Backyard. The Backyard.

Q. Now, Mr. Blackburn, what does Variety do to protect its trademarks?

- A. We register them originally, we keep them registered when the renewal dates come up, and we take action when they're being infringed.
- Q. So, Mr. Blackburn, why did Roses make the decision to adopt The Backyard trademark?
- A. It was part of our strategy -- this happened in 1993, which was right when we were in the thick of our trying to figure out and trying to establish in our customers' minds our own niche in comparison really with Walmart. We wanted to develop a line of products that were inexpensive, and that meant private labels. You weren't having to pay someone for the name brand that you were getting, but you developed good quality products and you'd have a name on them for your line of those products.

And so that was the idea in the lawn and garden department. They decided they were going to develop private label goods in lawn and garden -- the whole gamut of them from hoses and sprinklers and patio umbrellas and grills and grilling accessories and all of those things.

- Q. So what did Roses do after it made the decision to adopt and use the Backyard trademark?
- A. I met with the merchants and understood what they were doing and I got in touch with your firm about preparing

the registration application.

- Q. When was that, in 1993 I think you said?
- A. Yes, it was in 1993.
- Q. Did Roses file a federal trademark application in the United States Patent and Trademark Office?
  - A. We did.

- Q. Why did Roses file a federal trademark application if it only had stores in ten states?
- A. Well, we wanted the protection of the federal laws for our mark. We wanted the mark to have protection in all 50 states because we were hoping and expecting to expand into other areas so that would best be served by having a federal mark. And it's also easier for your competitors to find a mark that's registered on the -- in the federal trademark office so it's known and they won't use it.
- Q. So, Mr. Blackburn, are federal trademark applications and related documents available for viewing by the public?
- A. They are. There is a website that's maintained by the trademark office and I am computer illiterate, but I can go on there and find -- look up trademarks that use Backyard or use some particular word in just a matter of minutes. You can easily get on their site and use -- you don't have to have a password, you just go onto their site and you can look them up.

- Q. So, Mr. Blackburn, what was your involvement in the trademark application process for The Backyard trademark?
- A. Well, I didn't draft the application, obviously that was drafted by your firm, but I reviewed what needed to be reviewed and we signed the necessary documents for you to file.
- Q. All right. Mr. Blackburn, at this point I would like to have you refer to some exhibits. Do you have your exhibit book --
  - A. Not yet.

MS. TRIMMER: May I, your Honor?

(Ms. Trimmer providing documents to the witness)

- Q. Now, Mr. Blackburn, would you turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-52(C) at page 9. Do you recognize this document?
- A. This is the application for registration of the federal trademark for The Backyard.
- Q. All right. What is written on page one of this application?
- A. "Mark, The Backyard, class number 42 (prior U.S. class 100) to the Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks. Roses Stores, Inc., P.O. Drawer 947, Henderson, NC 27536. State of incorporation, North Carolina. Applicant requests registration of the above identified mark shown in the accompanying drawing in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the principal register established by

the act of July 5, 1946, for retail store services in the field of lawn and garden equipment and supplies in class 42. Applicant has a bonafide intention to use the mark in commerce on or in connection with the above identified services. The mark will be used on advertising and promotion for the services, on signage, and in other ways customary to the trade."

- Q. Mr. Blackburn, why is The Backyard trademark in plain block form?
- A. Well, we had discussed that internally. We wanted the widest possible registration of the mark. We didn't want it tied to one kind of script or one way of showing it. We wanted it just words, The Backyard. That was what we were getting the registration for, and so it was done in block characters.
- Q. All right. So the application states, The mark will be used on advertising and promotion for the services, on signage, and in other ways customary to the trade." Is that in fact how Variety has used the trademark over the past 25 years?
- A. Yes. We've used it in advertising like tabloid inserts and promotions for the services and ads and on signage, both in the stores and on shelving and on the products themselves that have the marks on them. Those are the ways that are customary to the trade.

- Q. All right. So what happened next after the application was filed?
- A. After the application was filed, the trademark office did a search of their records to see if somebody had already registered it. And after they had done a check to see if that had been done and determined that it hadn't been registered by anybody else, they notified us that it was eligible to be registered and that the next step would be to publish it.
- Q. All right. Now, Mr. Blackburn, turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-58 at 9. Can you identify this for the jury?
  - A. This one at page 9.

- Q. The notice of publication.
- A. The notice of publication.
  - Q. Just use the copy on the board -- on the screen, Mr. Blackburn.
  - A. Wait a minute, I do think I have it here.

    (Perusing exhibits). I found it. Okay. This was dated May 21, 1993, and it's the Notice of Publication from the trademark office. And it states that: The mark of the application identified, which is The Backyard, appears to be entitled to registration. The mark will, in accordance with Section 12(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946, as amended, be published in the Official Gazette on the date indicated above for the purpose of opposition by any person who believes he

will be damaged by registration of the mark.

- Q. All right. Let me stop you there. Did anyone oppose registration of this trademark by Roses?
  - A. No. No one did.

- Q. So as you turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-58(C) at 8. Can you identify this, Mr. Blackburn?
- A. This is the Notice of Allowance that the Trademark Office sent to us. And this states that: The mark identified below, which is marked The Backyard, was published for opposition under 15 U.S. Code, Section 1062(a). No successful opposition was filed. In order to obtain registration, applicant must file a Statement of Use under 15 U.S. Code within six months of the mailing date of the notice.
  - Q. Now, what is the Statement of Use, Mr. Blackburn?
- A. The Statement of Use is that you actually are using the mark in commerce. So you can register a mark without having used it yet and many times that's what takes place, but you have to actually use the mark in commerce to be able to perfect the registration.
- Q. Now, Mr. Blackburn, when you filed the Statement of Use did you also file what are called specimens showing the mark in commerce?
- A. Yes. The Statement of Use was filed actually in 1994 and you don't just say you're using it, you have to

```
prove to the office that you're using it. So you have to file what are called specimens with them, which are actual examples of how you've used that mark, which for us was The Backyard, how you have used it in commerce.
```

- Q. And in 1994 what kinds of goods was The Backyard trademark being used on?
- A. It was being used on a wide variety of goods that are sold in our lawn and garden department.
- Q. Was it being used on barbecue grills and grill accessories?
- A. It was.
  - Q. So that was in 1994, correct?
- 13 A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

24

25

- Q. So what happened after the Statement of Use was filed?
- A. After the Statement of Use was filed, a registration was in fact -- they were accepted and a registration was in fact issued by the Trademark Office.
- Q. All right. Will you turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit
  P-1.
  - MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, plaintiff moves Exhibit 58 into evidence.
- THE COURT: Received.

# (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 58 received into evidence)

Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit

P-1. Would you just describe briefly what this is?

A. Well, this is a certified copy of the actual registration. This certificate was -- cover certificate was issued in 2015, but attached to it is the actual registration for The Backyard which assigned it a registration number and that was in 1994.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, plaintiff moves P-1 into evidence.

THE COURT: Received.

## (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-1 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now, Mr. Blackburn, turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-58(E) at 174. Do you have that?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Can you identify what P-58(E) is?
- A. P-58(E) is the combined declaration under Section 8 and Section 15 that was filed with the Trademark and Patent Office in the year 2000.
- Q. And what was the purpose of this declaration under Section 815, Mr. Blackburn?
- A. After you've been given a registration, you have to use it and continue to use it and a lot of companies don't do that, and the Trademark Office has this requirement in place so that people who don't use them for whatever reason, they can clear those out so other people can use them. But this was our declaration that we had continued to use them in

commerce, and it was also a declaration under Section 15 because at this point, we were entitled -- if we had been using it continuously in commerce for that period of time, we were entitled to have the mark established as incontestable.

- Q. What is your understanding as to the meaning of that term "incontestable"?
- A. It means that with very few exceptions, someone can't come in and say you weren't entitled to have that mark registered. It wasn't a valid registration.
- Q. All right. Now, Mr. Blackburn, explain what happened in 2004 and 2014.
- A. Those were the 10 and 20-year anniversaries of the registration of the mark, and to keep the mark active and registered you have to file renewals. So in both those years, in 2004 and 2014, we filed renewal affidavits which said that we still were using the mark and gave further specimens.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, plaintiff moves Exhibit P-58(E) into evidence.

THE COURT: Received.

## (Plaintiff Exhibit No. P-58(E) received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now, Mr. Blackburn, turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-59 at 22. Can you identify this for the record, Mr. Blackburn?
  - A. This is what is called a tab or insert. It's an

advertising circular. And this one was from 2014, and it has various items in it that are being sold in this advertisement. And you see on this first page, The Backyard -- on that first you see it up there in the left-hand corner. And it's hard to see, but right above Backyard is The. And it's -- that "The" is there every time we use Backyard. And it's also hard to see after the D, but there's an R in the circle.

That little logo that's being shown with it, that was drawn by Sheila Moffett, who was our advertising person when we first came up with The Backyard. That was really her idea and she was -- when she did this design, she was showing the whole range of products that we were going to use the mark on and that in fact we did use the mark on. It's everything from garden shears to shovels to patio umbrellas to grilling accessories. There's a grilling fork with a hotdog on it and a spatula to show we were using it on a whole range of products.

- Q. What else was it being used on at the time, Mr. Blackburn?
- A. Well, it was also used on grills. When you get to the page that's on the screen there, you can see one of the grills that was a Backyard grill that was being sold.
- MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves into evidence Plaintiff's Exhibit P-59, page 22.

THE COURT: Received.

### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-59, page 22 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now, Mr. Blackburn, turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-59 at 15. Can you identify this, Mr. Blackburn?
- A. This was the specimen that was attached to the renewal application in 2004, and it's for a sprinkler that you attach to a hose and as you see up in the left-hand corner is The Backyard and there is the product description on there. This is the cardboard backing that the sprinkler was attached to when it was sold in the store.

MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves Exhibit P-59 into evidence.

THE COURT: Received.

# (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-59, page 15 received into evidence)

- 18 Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now, Mr. Blackburn, do you have 19 P-59 at 10?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Is this a specimen that was filed along with a Section 815 affidavit in the year 2000?
    - A. Yes. This is the backing on a nozzle for a hose.
  - Q. And, Mr. Blackburn, when that specimen was filed in the year 2000 to demonstrate that The Backyard trademark was

- being used, was that specimen accepted by the Trademark
  Office?
  - A. Not initially.
  - Q. Why not?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- A. They said, well, this is how you're using it on a product, but we need to see that you're also doing what you said, using it for retail store services.
- Q. All right. So in essence what this is saying is that on the public record of the trademark office, The Backyard mark is shown as being used both on goods and in services, correct?
- 12 A. Correct.
- Q. And was this specimen eventually accepted by the Trademark Office?
- 15 A. It was.
- Q. Would you turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-58 at 154.

  I think we may be having an equipment -- is that it? Okay.

  Can you identify this, Mr. Blackburn? It's P-58(E) at 154.
- 19 A. P-58(E).
- 20 Q. (E) and 154.
  - A. I do not have that in my book.
- Q. All right. We'll move forward. You just testified that the rejection of the specimen was withdrawn and it was accepted; is that right?
- 25 A. That's correct.

1 All right. Can we now move to Plaintiff's Q. 2 Exhibit 59 at 1. Can you identify this, Mr. Blackburn? 3 This is the specimen that was filed with the original Statement of Use in 1994. 4 5 All right. What does that show being used in Q. 6 connection with The Backyard trademark? 7 Well, what you're looking at is a little section 8 from one of the tab circulars that we advertised with and it's showing The Backyard mark, and The Backyard is there and 9 10 underneath it is a lawnmower that you would buy in our lawn 11 and garden department. 12 All right. Ο. 13 MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves Exhibit P-59 at 1. 14 THE COURT: Received. 15 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-59, page 1 received into evidence) MR. ADAMS: And also P-59, 30, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Received. (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-59, page 30 received into 18 19 evidence) 20 (By Mr. Adams) So how do you know this specimen Ο. 21 was actually filed in the Patent and Trademark Office? 22 It's got a stamp on it from the patent office mail Α. 23 room. It says, "Patent and Trademark Office mail room 24 March 2, 1994."

Q. All right. Mr. Blackburn, you've referred several

times to The Backyard trademark. Would you explain what you're referring to?

- A. Well, it's the words "The Backyard" which appear in that banner right there across the circle. And in this particular tab it's used that way, but it's really that word, Backyard, which is also used by itself further on in the tab.
  - O. Can we turn to that?
  - A. There it is.

- Q. Okay. And Mr. Blackburn, please turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-78. Can you identify Plaintiff's Exhibit P-78, Mr. Blackburn?
- A. Yes. This is the summary that was prepared under my direction and supervision showing the advertising, print advertising expenses that we had that were attributable to merchandise and services for Backyard from 1993 to 2012.

  That's what's shown at the top. And then below that is the expense for labeling and packaging that had to do with Backyard.
- Q. And just in general, just summarize those totals for the jury.
- A. Okay. What -- in the top you see the year in the first column and then the total tab expense we had for that year. The number of tabs, the number of tabs that had Backyard merchandise in it. And Backyard merchandise by its very nature, that stuff was sold principally from Easter

through the end of summer, so only certain months of the year that you'd be selling Backyard merchandise. And then the percent that that number of tabs represents to the whole, and then what the dollar value attributable to that -- those tabs is shown in the last column.

- Q. And it's many million of dollars, isn't it, Mr. Blackburn?
  - A. It's over \$40 million.

MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves Plaintiff's Exhibit 78.

THE COURT: Received.

#### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 78 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now, what else is shown in Plaintiff's Exhibit P-78, Mr. Blackburn?
- A. That's the expense attributable to the packaging that would have Backyard on it. For instance, that nozzle that you saw, what it cost to print The Backyard on that nozzle holder. So this is -- we only had records for these years, 2009 through 2013, at this point when this was done. This was done in 2013. So we applied the cost that that would represent to the -- the cost of the product, and in that last column that's what the expense was.
  - Q. Mr. Blackburn, is packaging important to Variety?
- A. It's very important. It's one of the key ways that you -- that customers decide what they want to buy, and so it's very important. The packaging is very important.

- Q. Does Variety consider that to be a form of advertising?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Mr. Blackburn, so far as you know, do customers frequently come into a Roses or other Variety store without a complete list of products they want to purchase?
- A. Yes. Or they have some idea of what they want to purchase but they don't know exactly which one they want to purchase.
  - Q. What does the packaging have to do with that?
- A. Well, it's very influential to them as to what they're going to buy, including the name that's on the product. The names, the tradenames that are associated with it or really even the sound of the name, what it represents to them can influence them in how they buy.

An example is you might come into a Roses store and you're looking for a grill and you pick up a box and it looks -- it's got the right price, it looks sturdy, it's the kind you want, and the name may be Fly by Night. And you might think, well, I'm not sure I want to buy that product with that name on it, even though it's got the price I want. But if it's got the name Backyard on it, that sounds like something I can see in my backyard. I think I'll take it to the front desk and buy it. So it can play an important role in the decision that the customer makes.

- Q. All right. Mr. Blackburn, turning to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-7. Would you identify this for the record?
- A. This was an Easter tab that we put out in 2013, I believe is the date on there. Yes, 2013. And it's showing Easter clothing there on that first page. It tells people that they can go to our Facebook or website, Roses' Facebook or website, and then the merchandise that's in there from -- as you go through it, you get further on and you get to the section that is Backyard merchandise.
  - Q. All right. Let's take a look at that.
- A. So here you see you've got that Backyard about midway down the page and then also in the yellow box, and it's showing grills that we're selling. And it's also showing other things that are featured in the lawn and garden department that you can buy, some of which are actually Backyard, have Backyard on the merchandise and others are just part of the department that is where the goods are sold.

MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves Exhibit P-57 into evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-57 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now, Mr. Blackburn, are you familiar with Walmart's advertising for its Backyard products?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And how have you become familiar with their advertising?
- A. Well, like anybody else, I get circulars that they may send in the mail or I've shopped in their stores and seen the labeling on the products and -- but more particularly, of course, in this proceeding where they have produced for us information with regard to their advertising.
- Q. And would you describe your understanding of what Walmart's advertising is?
- A. Well, it's the same things -- same ways we advertise. It's print media, website, advertisement on your products. The things that are customary in the trade.
- Q. All right. Mr. Blackburn, I'll refer you to Exhibit P-63, please. I want you to read into the record the second paragraph of Walmart's answer to Variety's interrogatory number 13.
- A. "Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, applicant currently advertises, intends to advertise its Backyard Grill and design products via the Internet, print media and other typical retail advertising means."
- Q. Does that confirm your understanding about the way Walmart advertises and promotes its Backyard products?
  - A. It does.

2.1

Q. Mr. Blackburn -- I'm sorry.

```
1
               MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves Exhibit P-63.
2
               THE COURT: Received.
3
        (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-63 received into evidence)
 4
         Q.
               (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, has The Backyard
5
    brand been a successful brand for Variety?
 6
         Α.
               It has.
7
               Do you have any numbers of sales that would reflect
         Ο.
8
    that?
9
               From 2002 to 2015 we sold over $64 million worth of
         Α.
10
    products with The Backyard mark.
11
         Q.
               We're talking about products, correct?
12
         Α.
              Yes.
13
              Products?
         Ο.
14
         Α.
              Correct.
15
              Products. Okay. Is it Variety's view that The
         Q.
16
    Backyard trademark is a valuable trademark?
17
         Α.
               Yes.
18
               Is that because of the amount of sales?
         Ο.
19
         Α.
               That's part of it.
20
               And is it also your view that The Backyard
         Q.
21
    trademark is a strong trademark?
22
         Α.
               It is.
23
         Ο.
               And why is that?
24
               Well, we've got several ways of showing that.
         Α.
25
    First of all, a third party offered to buy the mark from us
```

```
1
    or pay us a royalty to use the mark. That was back in 1998.
 2
    There's a chain of stores, Southern States. They have stores
 3
    that are farm and garden and pet stores. And they approached
 4
    us about buying the mark from us, buying Backyard from us or
 5
    paying us a royalty to use it.
 6
              All right. Mr. Blackburn, let's take a look at
 7
    Plaintiff's Exhibit P-8.
 8
              MR. PUZELLA: Object, your Honor. It's hearsay.
 9
              THE COURT: What was the last thing?
10
              MR. PUZELLA: The document. Can we take it off the
11
    screen before the jury sees it?
12
              THE COURT: What is it?
13
              MR. ADAMS: It's just a corporate document of the
14
    plaintiff, your Honor, which the witness can identify.
15
              THE COURT: All right.
16
              MR. PUZELLA: It's a letter from a third party that
17
    they're offering for the truth of the matter asserted, your
18
    Honor.
19
              MR. ADAMS: It's an internal memo, your Honor.
                                                               Ιt
20
    is not a letter from a third party.
21
              THE COURT:
                           Okay.
22
              MR. PUZELLA: Reflects a communication from a third
23
    party. It's hearsay.
24
              THE COURT: Overruled.
25
              MR. ADAMS: Put it back up.
```

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Can you identify this for the record, Mr. Blackburn.
  - A. That is a memo dated September 16, 1998, that was sent to Linda Nestor --
    - O. And who --
- A. -- from Debbie Moore. Both of them were employees of Roses -- of Variety Wholesalers at the time.
- Q. Is this a document that has been maintained in Roses' and Variety's possession, custody and control since on or about creation of this document?
- 11 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

2.1

- 12 Q. And who's Linda Nestor?
- A. Linda Nestor was one of the people in our company
  who dealt largely with contracts, the administration of
  contracts.
  - Q. And who is Debbie Moore?
  - A. She worked under Linda Nestor.
- Q. This document is dated September 16, 1998. That's about four or five years after Roses started using The Backyard trademark; is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. So just read the body -- one question, though.

  notice in the re line, it says "Backyard Registered

  Trademark" but there is no "the" in front of The Backyard.

  Does that have any significance to you?

- A. Well, our people understood that the key part of the registration was Backyard. The word Backyard.
  - Q. But "the" is an article, correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. So read the text of that memo.
- A. "I received a phone call today from Bob

  Desblen" (pronounced -- and then spelled out Day-be-an) -- so
  that may be an I. It is. Day-be-an. "Advertising Manager
  for Southern States Cooperative Mid-Atlantic States Farm

  Stores regarding our registered trademark for Backyard. He
  and his company are wanting to know if Roses is interested in
  licensing it or selling our registered rights to them. I
  told him that I didn't have the authorization to make this
  decision, but I would make sure my superiors and legal consul
  (sic) were made aware of his request."
- Q. Once a decision was made, he wanted to be informed; is that right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Did Roses, in fact, consider selling The Backyard trademark?
  - A. We briefly considered it, but we decided against it because we couldn't think of a better name to use on our own products. We would have -- by the end, we were expanding it to more and more products and we would have had to come up with some other name and we couldn't really think of a better

1 name. 2 MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves Exhibit P-8 into 3 evidence, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: It's received. 5 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-8 received into evidence) 6 (By Mr. Adams) And this document was furnished to 7 Walmart some years ago, was it not? 8 Α. Correct. 9 Q. Did Roses ever license The Backyard trademark to 10 Southern States?

- A. No, we didn't.
- Q. Has it ever licensed the trademark to anyone?
- 13 A. No.

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Why does the contact from Southern States support Variety's view that the trademark, Backyard trademark, is a valuable trademark?
- A. Well, they were offering to either pay us a royalty on what they sold using it or to buy it outright. And this wasn't when we were in bankruptcy, when they might think they could get it for a song. This was after we were out of bankruptcy, we were part of Variety Wholesalers, which had a strong balance sheet. So they were not talking about just picking it up on the side.
- Q. So, Mr. Blackburn, do you have any other evidence that The Backyard trademark is valuable in the marketplace?

- A. Yes. The evidence of other retailers who have, in fact, tried to use it.
  - Q. For example?

- A. Fred's, which is a chain of stores -- they're based in Memphis, Tennessee. They're west of here. But they're about the same size as Roses Stores, sell the same things. Many of the Fred's stores have pharmacies in them, too, as well. That's an extra feature. But Fred's, they developed a line of grills and they called it Backyard Traditions and they started selling those grills and, of course, our buyers found out about it and brought it to my attention.
- Q. All right. Turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit P-2, Mr. Blackburn. Could you identify that for the record?
- A. This is what's called a cease and desist letter.

  It's a letter that when you find out your trademark is being infringed, your attorney sends a letter to the company that's infringing it and telling them that we own the rights to that mark and to stop selling products using our mark.
- Q. So this letter did, in fact, go to Fred's; is that correct?
  - A. It did.
  - Q. And what happened next?
- A. They stopped using it. They had already had grills manufactured for -- under the use with Backyards on them, and we let them know that it was okay to sell through the ones

they had already manufactured, but that after they sold all those, they weren't to order any new ones and that's what they did.

Q. Does the decision --

MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves P-2 into evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-2 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Does the decision by Fred's to stop using the rights to The Backyard trademark indicate anything to you about the value of The Backyard trademark?
- A. Well, it showed that they knew that -- first of all, as to its value, they considered it a very good name to put on grills and to use and so that's why they did that, but it also showed that they recognized that we had the rights to that mark and they stopped using it.
- Q. Mr. Blackburn, do you have any further evidence that The Backyard mark is valuable in the marketplace?
- A. Another retailer decided to use Backyard on grilling products and that was Harris Teeter. They opened a little section in their stores and had Backyard in it and sold grilling supplies in there. So we found out about that and contacted them, contacted our attorney, sent them a letter and they agreed to stop. They took down the banner and stopped using Backyard in their stores.

- Q. All right. Mr. Blackburn, similar to Harris
  Teeter, Fred's and Southern States, do you have any evidence
  that Walmart considers The Backyard mark to be valuable?
- A. Yes, there's quite a lot of evidence about that.

  Obviously, that's what we're here for. They thought Backyard was a good name to put on their grills and grill accessories.

And so in 2000, after doing some studies, consumer studies where they compared a whole bunch of names to each other, some of which are very famous names like George Foreman Grills or Weber, they compared Backyard to these other names and compared it to their own name. They were using Mainstay. They compared it to Sam's Choice. And they ultimately decided that Backyard is what they wanted -- the name they wanted on their grills and grill accessories and that's what they do.

Q. Now --

MR. PUZELLA: Move to strike, your Honor. There's no foundation for his knowledge concerning Walmart's activities. None.

THE COURT: Disallow that testimony. All right.

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) All right. Mr. Blackburn, let's take a look at Plaintiff's Exhibit -- Demonstrative Exhibit PX-1. Can you identify this document?
- A. Walmart provided us with their -- in this proceeding with their sales of products that had Backyard on

it. And this runs from October 8, 2011, which is the date they told us they first started selling products with Backyard on them, through November 21, 2015, and so it shows week by week the sales that they had. As you can see, there is a seasonal spike during the months from March through August of each year when -- the high sales point for those numbers.

MR. PUZELLA: Objection again, your Honor. There's no foundation for this witness to be able to testify about Walmart's documents and its data.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, this -- this document and these exhibits have been stipulated to. This is a simply demonstrative exhibit created based on Walmart's own information they furnished in this lawsuit, and Mr. Blackburn is not -- he has been dealing in trademarks for 30, 40 years and perfectly competent under Rule 701 to examine this chart and explain what he sees.

MR. PUZELLA: This witness is not an expert in this document and underlying documents. This is a summary,

Federal Rule of Evidence 1006 summary. It is not the subject of this trial which only concerns liability.

MR. ADAMS: It definitely concerns the strength of the trademark, your Honor, and exactly why it's being offered, to show the strength of the trademark and it was

```
1
    offered in response to my question to Mr. Blackburn --
 2
               THE COURT:
                          All right. Do you have a lot more
 3
    questions with this witness or are we almost finished?
 4
               MR. ADAMS:
                           I'm sorry?
 5
                           Do you have a lot more questions for
               THE COURT:
 6
    this witness or are we almost finished with him?
 7
               MR. ADAMS: We are not almost finished.
 8
               THE COURT: We're not?
 9
              MR. ADAMS: I would say another 30 to 45 minutes.
10
               THE COURT: Well, I've been very passive in letting
11
    you go on with loads of stuff that was just unnecessary.
12
    We'll take a recess and this objection is sustained.
13
                  (Recess at 3:07 p.m. to 3:20 p.m.)
               THE COURT: Okay. Continue with your direct.
14
15
               Any more questions?
16
               MR. ADAMS: Yes, your Honor.
17
               (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, did Variety ever
         Q.
18
    give Walmart permission to use its Backyard trademark?
19
               It did not.
20
               Did Walmart ever ask Variety for permission to use
         Ο.
21
    The Backyard trademark?
22
               Not that I'm aware of.
         Α.
23
         Q.
               Do you know when Variety (sic) became aware of
24
    Variety's Backyard trademark?
25
               They became aware of it in early 2011.
         Α.
```

Q. And how do you know that?

A. Karen Dineen, one of their employees that's been referred to in the opening statements, testified that that was when they became aware of it.

MR. PUZELLA: Objection, your Honor. Again, there's no foundation for this testimony. He's giving testimony about Mrs. Dineen, who's a Walmart employee.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, in Walmart's answer, paragraph 39, read the very top three lines of that document.
- A. "Walmart admits that it was aware of plaintiff's United States trademark registration number 1,847,503 at the time it adopted The Backyard Grill + Design mark. Walmart denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 39."
- Q. Mr. Blackburn, assume that Walmart says that it knew that Variety was using The Backyard trademark as the name of its lawn and garden center but did not know that it was using The Backyard trademark on products such as grills and grill accessories. Was there any way for Walmart to find out how Variety was using The Backyard trademark?
- A. Yes. Obviously, I testified earlier that you can go on the trademark office's website and you can access those documents. It's easy, quick, can be done. They could have seen the specimens that we filed that showed products we were using it on and made it absolutely clear that we were using

it on products.

- Q. Including grills, correct?
- A. Yes, including grills.
- Q. Now, suppose Walmart says that it knew that Variety was using The Backyard -- I'm sorry, strike that.

Even if that information had somehow gotten past all Walmart's lawyers and executives, was there another way that Walmart could have learned how Variety was using The Backyard trademark?

- A. Sure. The home office calls one of the stores that's near a Roses and says, go check it out. Tell us what -- go see what kind of Backyard products -- how they're using Backyard in their store and call us back and tell us.
- Q. Is there typically a Walmart near most Roses Stores?
- A. Yes. They're saturated throughout our sales area and in Henderson the store is less than a mile from -- the Walmart store is less than a mile from the Roses store and here in Elizabeth City it's about four miles away.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, plaintiff moves P-62 into evidence.

THE COURT: It will be received.

#### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-62 received into evidence)

Q. (By Mr. Adams) What if Walmart says they don't consider Roses to be a competitor of Walmart?

- A. They file an annual report which they're required to file with the Securities and Exchange Commission and in it they have to describe their competition, and in their annual reports they say that they face intense competition from regional variety stores, and that's exactly what we are, a regional variety chain of stores.
- Q. Mr. Blackburn, have you been involved in this lawsuit ever since it was filed?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And before this lawsuit was filed there was also a proceeding for a short period of time in the Patent and Trademark Office, correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. And has it been your role as Variety's sole in-house counsel to monitor the status of the trademark opposition and the lawsuit?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And have you reviewed documents and pleadings and so forth that have been filed in this case?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And with particular regard to the issue of Walmart's knowledge of its -- Variety's sales at various times like during the trademark proceeding, litigation, have you studied documents that inform you about Walmart's commercial activities during those particular time periods?

A. Yes.

MR. ADAMS: And bring up PX-2.

Α.

Yes.

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Has someone under your supervision and control prepared an exhibit which explains Walmart's commercial activities during various stages of this lawsuit as it relates to Walmart's sales activities?
  - MR. PUZELLA: Objection, your Honor.

    THE COURT: Overruled.
- 10 Q. (By Mr. Adams) Is that what this document is?

  11 MR. PUZELLA: Objection to the document, your

  12 Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) All right. Just briefly, Mr. Blackburn, explain what we're showing here.
- A. Well, on this chart, particularly those arrows that you're seeing are showing the introduction of products into commerce using Backyard that Walmart sold.
  - Q. And what are UPCs?
- A. UPCs are barcodes and this -- they identify individual products. That's how retailers are able to track what's sold, when you're out of something in the store. It's called an SKU, stock keeping unit. And each of these lines represents a different stock keeping unit, a different product that The Backyard name was being applied to by

Walmart.

- Q. All right. Now, what does the top bar represent?
- A. The top bar with the arrows is showing all the Walmart SKUs that were added, the new products they put the name on, after we went into the trademark office and objected to their trying to register Backyard Grill as a mark. We found out about that -- I found out about it when the -- in May of 2012 I found out that Walmart was selling Backyard Grills, and so I contacted our outside counsel to tell them about it and they found out that Walmart had a proceeding going on in the Trademark Office to register Backyard marks.

And, of course, as I explained earlier in the registration of our mark, if you feel that you're going to be injured by registration of the mark, you can come in and object and the Trademark Office has a proceeding that you can go to.

So we objected. And we entered into the proceeding there in the Trademark Office and that happened in 2012 long about -- around June or August we entered into that. And in that proceeding they got to get discovery from us, so they asked us for all kinds of discovery which I gathered together. I mean, I personally gathered it together. I went to each office and got it from where it was. I got tabs, I got the various things together, put them together, produced them to our attorneys to deliver them to Walmart.

And those documents that we produced to them and in the deposition I gave and that Mike Burgess gave that they took, we described exactly what products we were using it on and that we were using it on grills. So there was no way they didn't know at that point that we were using -- that Backyard we had been using on grills and have used it since 1993. They knew that for a fact.

And what the chart is showing you, that despite that, they didn't just sell through what they already had got the way Fred's did, what they did was apply it to more and more. They said let's go full steam ahead. They applied it to more and more products and sold more and more units of them and kept reordering them despite knowing for an absolute, indisputable fact that that's what we were using them on. So that was in the Trademark Office.

Now, I've practiced law for 40 years. This was a shock to me. I thought it was all a mistake. I thought someone at Walmart slipped up and they didn't know what was going on. And once we went into the trademark office and explained so that they absolutely knew what we were using it on, they would back off like Fred's did or like Harris Teeter did. And I could not have conceived that the result of that would be, no, they're not going to back off, they're going to put it on more and more products and sell more and more of it and order more and more units of it.

Q. All right. Let's look --

- A. And that's exactly what that is showing.
- Q. I didn't mean to interrupt. Let's look at the bar in the middle. What does that --
- A. The bar in the middle is showing the products they added the name to after we produced to them in the trademark proceeding, we produced those tabs and those other things that showed we were using it on grills.
  - Q. All right. And then the bottom bar?
- A. That's what -- okay. So I thought in the trademark proceeding they would back off. That didn't happen, so we finally had to file a lawsuit. And even after we filed the lawsuit, they kept adding it to more and more products and selling more and more of them.
- MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, plaintiff moves Exhibit PX-2.

17 THE COURT: Received.

### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. PX-2 received into evidence)

MR. PUZELLA: Object, your Honor. Move to strike all of that testimony. The testimony is obviously intended to demonstrate the continued sale after learning --

THE COURT: You don't have to have a closing argument on every objection. So the answer is no, and you can sit down. And guess what, in a little while you're going to get to cross-examine him and then you can do all of that,

1 okay? 2 MR. PUZELLA: Thank you, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Thank you so much. 4 Q. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, turn to Plaintiff's 5 Exhibit 3. I'm sorry, PX-3. 6 MR. PUZELLA: Same objection. 7 THE COURT: Same ruling. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, can you identify 8 Q. 9 this document? 10 Α. Yes. This document is based on -- it was prepared 11 at my request and under my supervision, was prepared to show 12 the dollar amount of the goods that were sold at the various 13 points in all this controversy between us and Walmart. What does this have to do with Walmart's 14 15 willfulness or intention in carrying out their new grill brand? 16 17 Well, it shows just how intentional and willful it was. It shows that they sold \$770 million worth of Backyard 18 19 goods after we entered the trademark proceeding and sold --20 \$728 million of those sales were sold after we put in their 21 hands the documents that showed exactly what we were using 22 the mark on. And it shows that -- of that amount, 23 \$435 million worth of goods were sold after we went on and 24 filed the lawsuit. 25 Q. All right. Let's now look at PX-4.

MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves Exhibit PX-3, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

#### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. PX-3 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now PX-4, Mr. Blackburn.
- A. This is that same information from before which was in terms of dollars. This is the number of units that were put into commerce with Backyard name at those same various points. After we entered the trademark proceeding, they sold 91 million units of goods that had Backyard on it, and they sold 83 million units that had Backyard on them after we produced to them the evidence of what we were using it on and 50 million units after we filed the lawsuit.
  - Q. All right.

MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves PX-4, your Honor.

MR. PUZELLA: Same objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled. It's received.

#### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. PX-4 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now, let's go to Plaintiff's Exhibit PX-5, Mr. Blackburn. Looking at Plaintiff's Exhibit 5, Mr. Blackburn, can you explain to the jury what's being shown here?
- A. These are a variety of ways we've used The Backyard, the registered mark, in commerce.
  - Q. So let's go at them one at a time. Starting in the

upper left-hand corner.

- A. The upper left-hand corner is one of our grills.

  And it's hard to read, but above Backyard is "The." And

  after Backyard there's an R in a circle right after the D in

  it. And BBQ is underneath Backyard. This is a metal plate

  that's affixed to the grill.
  - O. And below that?
- A. Below that is The Backyard with Barbecue under it with R after the D on Backyard. And this is a red and black version that we use to -- on our packaging for Backyard grills.
  - Q. And the two on the right?
- A. The one at the top is -- well, the one at the bottom was the original colors that we used with that logo that we had developed, but here again, the registered thing is The Backyard and that's what's shown in the middle of the circle. And then we changed the colors later to show The Backyard.

MR. ADAMS: Plaintiff moves PX-5, your Honor.

THE COURT: It's received.

#### (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. PX-5 received into evidence)

- Q. Now, Mr. Blackburn, can you describe how a customer would encounter these Backyard marks in a Roses store or one of the other stores owned by Variety?
  - A. Well, when they come in the front door, we might

have one of these tabs there that they could look at and that would have those products advertised in them.

When they go back to that section of the store, the lawn and garden section, sometimes there's a cardboard stand there, display stand that would have The Backyard on it. And then it might be rakes and hoses and different kinds of implements in it.

On the shelves themselves might be what's called a shelf talker, which is a little sign on the shelves that tells you things about the products there in that section of the store.

And then there are the boxed items and packaged items that are displayed on the shelves that have Backyard printed on them. And there might be a grill set up back there that would be just like that one you see up there that has a metal plate with The Backyard affixed to it.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, I need just a minute. We have a couple of boxes -- actual grills that we're going to have Mr. Blackburn open. So with the Court's indulgence, we would like to get them out front and we'll open them quickly.

THE COURT: What are you doing now?

MR. ADAMS: We would like to open two of the boxes that have the actual grills in them, your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't think you get to do that.

MR. ADAMS: Okay. I would like to show Mr.

```
1
    Blackburn the actual boxes for his testimony.
 2
              THE COURT: I mean --
 3
              MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, I want to illustrate one of
 4
    the ways that the product is advertised and that's the
 5
    packaging. It won't take 30 seconds.
 6
              THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
 7
              So is there a cheaper line of merchandise in the
 8
    lawn and garden and grill area than Backyard?
 9
              THE WITNESS: I don't think so, your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: It's the bottom level?
              THE WITNESS: It's the level that's meant to be the
11
12
    biggest savings.
13
              THE COURT: Right. And so there's not something
14
    that says Roses grill or Roses product. It's -- The Backyard
15
    is the equivalent of Roses?
              THE WITNESS: Right. Now, there may be some items
16
17
    that we don't have Backyard on that just --
18
              THE COURT: They're blank.
19
              THE WITNESS:
                            Well, they have the label that -- the
20
    manufacturer, yes. They're not well-known, but they're the
21
    same manufacturers that make other things for us.
22
              THE COURT: Okay.
              Show him --
23
24
              MR. SHAW:
                          Okay.
25
              MR. LONG: This is Exhibit 6.
```

A. So there -- this is our Backyard grill, which you can see is a black metallic one just like the one in the picture up there, and there you see "The Backyard" up there on the -- at the top and you see the R up close, you can see the R after the D of Backyard. And the colors are red and black.

THE COURT: Do you think anybody ever goes into Roses with the -- written down on their note, buy the label Backyard Barbecue, or they just go into Roses because they know it's the cheapest place next to The Dollar Store and they buy the cheapest product and walk out because that's what Roses does?

THE WITNESS: Well --

THE COURT: It's like generic. It's totally generic, isn't it?

THE WITNESS: Well, they are not just interested in the cheapest product. They do want something that's going to hold up.

THE COURT: If they want the cheapest product, they might go to Dollar General or The Dollar Store, something that sneaks in under Roses.

THE WITNESS: But they did want to know that it holds up and that's where the name comes in. If they bought some of our Backyard things and they were satisfied with that.

1 THE COURT: Do you think they really care, like 2 they see quality or uniqueness in that? I mean, in the name 3 Backyard? 4 THE WITNESS: I think so because --5 THE COURT: Really? 6 THE WITNESS: -- one of the people on this jury 7 being interviewed, she said that value was a big thing for 8 her but she wanted the thing to have quality. And so they 9 are -- you'd be surprised --10 THE COURT: It's the bottom. You don't have 11 anything below this. It's like that's where you start. 12 THE WITNESS: It is the lowest one, and we think we 13 don't sell shoddy merchandise in our store. But the customer 14 is looking for that. They want to know that the product is 15 one they can rely on. 16 THE COURT: Okav. 17 This is The Backyard grill that Walmart sells and Α. 18 as you can see on the end here that's towards me, you can 19 note -- if you turn that -- the edge of it -- you can 20 actually see the grill and it's the same kind of grill. 21 Looks very -- almost identical to our grill. And the colors, 22 again, are red and black. The Backyard is shown on it. 23 so as you can see, they're very similar. 24 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, plaintiff moves Exhibits 25 P-6 and P-7 into evidence.

THE COURT: They're received.

### (Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. P-6 and P-7 received into evidence)

MR. SHAW: If I may.

(Plaintiff's counsel conferring briefly at counsel table off the record)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, I want you to note the placement of the TM after Backyard and before the word Grill.
  - A. Yes.

- Q. First of all, what does the TM refer to?
- A. TM is a mark that you put when you're claiming trademark rights in a name before you've registered it in the trademark office. So that's to notify people that you're claiming a trademark right in that name or that word.
- Q. And what does the use of the word TM tell you about Walmart's trademark claim?
- A. Well, they placed it not after grill, they placed it after Backyard. In fact, grill is on the next line and it's not down there. They put TM after Backyard. Well, that's because you can't get a trademark on grill. You can only get it on some word that's not descriptive. And so they put the TM after Backyard because that's -- that's what they're claiming the trademark right in and it's just that word, Backyard.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, if you bear with me

one minute, I'm going to try to streamline what I have left, which is not too much. (Perusing documents).

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, has Variety ever conducted any studies to determine where else Roses' customers shop?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Would you take a look at P-87(A) and 87(B).
- A. 87(A) is a study that was done in April 2009 by America's Research Group, and they were giving us information about our customers and where they shop and what -- various information that would be useful to us and prepared a report for us. And with respect to where else they shop, this report states that of those who said Roses is their secondary store to shop, 52 percent said Walmart is their primary store to shop.
- Q. And what does that say about the status of Roses and Walmart as competitors?
- A. Well, obviously they're direct competitors.

  52 percent of the people who shop in our store shop at
  Walmart in this survey.
  - Q. And 87(B)?
- A. 87(B) is a similar study that was done in May of 2012, and that study reported that of those who shop at Walmart -- wait a minute. This one shows primary ones that -- of those who shop at Roses, the primary store to shop

for items sold at Roses, Roses Express, 42.7 percent their secondary store was Walmart.

- Q. All right. Mr. Blackburn, are Walmart's Backyard products and Variety's Backyard products ever sold close to each other?
- A. Well, they're certainly not sold in the same store. We sell ours in our store and they sell theirs in their store. But they're close in the sense that, as I said earlier, the Walmart store in Henderson is less than a mile from the Walmart store in -- from the Roses store in Henderson and here in Elizabeth City it's less than four miles.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, plaintiff moves P-87(A) and P-87(B) in evidence.

THE COURT: It will be received.

# (Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. P-87(A) and P-87(B) received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, how would a customer encounter both Backyard trademarks?
- A. Well, they might be shopping in our store for something that they particularly went to get and see The Backyard grill that we sell there and then go over to the Walmart store for something else they're looking for and they'll see a Backyard grill there too. So they would see two Backyard grills in the same day or day or so apart.

- Q. Is there anything of significance about the way the trademarks are displayed?
- A. Well, in terms of the customer remembering it, they're not going to remember grill or they're not going to remember barbecue because that's what the product is. If they're remembering the name of the thing, they're going to remember it's Backyard, and it's the same name at both stories.

THE COURT: They're not going to be able to go into Lowe's or ACE Hardware or one of those shops and find either of these items, are they?

THE WITNESS: They are not.

THE COURT: Because they're not marketed anywhere except in the proprietary setting of Roses and Walmart.

THE WITNESS: Correct, your Honor.

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, what about after purchase, would consumers ever encounter both trademarks?
- A. Well, they may well -- some neighbor visiting another neighbor and one of them's bought Backyard from one store and one's bought it from another and they notice that both of them are Backyard.
- Q. Now, Mr. Blackburn, having looked at the two boxes, did you see -- do you see any similarities between Variety's trademark and Walmart's trademark?
  - A. Well, they're identical. The TM after Backyard on

Walmart comes right -- it comes right after Backyard and the registered mark on the Roses mark comes right after Backyard. They're both claiming the same word is their trademark, only ours is the one -- ours is the real one. Ours is the one that was registered in the trademark office.

- Q. Now turn to PX-8, Mr. Blackburn. Can you identify PX-8?
- A. This is a comparison list of the items that we sell under The Backyard mark in the left-hand column, and the right-hand column is items that Walmart sells under The Backyard name.
- Q. Now, who has the larger list of products being sold under The Backyard trademark?
- A. We do, because we use it for our whole lawn and garden department where they use it just for a subset.
- MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, plaintiff moves PX-8 into evidence.

THE COURT: It will be received.

## (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. PX-8 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, during the four years -- during a four-year period during which Walmart was selling Backyard products, do you know of any Variety's customers ever reporting confusion between Variety's products and Walmart's products?
  - A. No, and I don't see how it's possible that we would

know.

- Q. Well, let me just ask you, is there any practical way to know the answer to that question?
- A. No. If, for instance, let's say a customer comes in bringing a Walmart Backyard grill and they bring it to Roses, they're confused, they felt they bought it there. And they take it to our customer service desk and show it to the customer service person there and she tries to ring it up and she says, well, that's not one of our SKUs. You must have bought that someplace else.

So how does that ever get known in the home office? How does what that customer service representative just encountered there ever get up to the buyer in the buying office in the home office? Even if it were to happen right there in Henderson, the chances that that would ever get from that level up to -- the clerks in the stores are not dealing with the buyers who buy the products and the people who are involved with the marketing of that. They're just the clerks in the stores and that's who the customer is going to bring it to.

- Q. Does Variety have any specific procedure in its stores to transmit information of that type from customer service representatives up to the home office?
- A. No, we do not. We have no procedure in place. And even if we had one in place, one of the problems is that the

clerk down there would not understand why that was important. The clerk in our store doesn't know there's a lawsuit going on here between us and the clerk in the store wouldn't know what the significance of somebody having found a Backyard grill in another store would be. It's just not something they deal with.

- Q. Mr. Blackburn, I believe you said earlier that
  Variety obtained an incontestable trademark. Can you explain
  why that is so important to Variety?
- A. Well, obviously we were investing a lot of time and effort and money in developing a particular mark that was going to help us compete against Walmart. That was really how it came out. And it was going to be our line that was only available in our store, so it was important that it couldn't be taken from us and used elsewhere because it was supposed to draw people to our stores. And, lo and behold, what happened, the very people we wanted to compete with using that are the very people who took the mark and then put it on their goods.
- Q. Do you believe that Variety's stores have been harmed by Walmart's use of Roses' Backyard trademark?
  - A. Yes. Certainly.

- Q. In what respect?
- A. Well, the mark is -- Walmart has sold something
  like 108 million units. They flooded -- that's like one for

```
every third American. And so if a customer thinks of Backyard, oh, yeah, you get that at, fill in the blank. It's not Roses, it's Walmart. That's where they know that name.
```

- Q. And how did Roses' or Variety's sales compare to Walmart's in The Backyard area?
- A. Well, I told you we sold \$64 million, which is significant for us, in the period from 2002 to 2015, whereas they've sold nearly a billion dollars' worth in a four-year period.
- Q. So Mr. Blackburn, in most parts of the United States, if someone did recognize the significance of The Backyard trademark, who would they likely think it belonged to?
  - A. They would think it belonged to --

MR. PUZELLA: Objection. Foundation. This witness has no basis for knowing that.

THE COURT: Agreed. It's sustained.

MR. ADAMS: Just one minute, your Honor.

19 (Plaintiff's counsel conferring briefly at counsel table off
20 the record)

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Mr. Blackburn, were you surprised that Walmart did not seek Variety's permission to use The Backyard trademark?
- A. Yes. I was not just surprised, I was shocked and dismayed.

```
1
              And were you surprised when they didn't stop after
         Q.
    we objected?
2
 3
         Α.
                    Obviously Fred's stopped, Harris Teeter
 4
    stopped. Walmart not only didn't stop, they poured on the
5
    steam.
 6
              MR. ADAMS: No more questions, your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: Cross.
8
              MR. PUZELLA: Thank you, your Honor.
9
              May we have a moment to hand up some binders? Your
10
    Honor, may we hand binders to the jury of the exhibits so
11
    that they don't have to rely on the screen if they choose or
12
    would you prefer just the screen?
13
              THE COURT: Yes. We're a simple court here.
                                                              Less
14
    is more.
15
              MR. PUZELLA: So just the screen?
              THE COURT: Yes. Let's use the screen.
16
17
              MR. PUZELLA: May I approach?
18
              THE COURT:
                          You may.
19
     (Attorney Puzella providing an exhibit binder to the witness)
20
                           CROSS-EXAMINATION
21
    BY MR. PUZELLA:
22
              Mr. Blackburn, what are the trademarks that Variety
23
    contends are infringed in this case? Is there more than one?
24
              There is the registered trademark, The Backyard,
         Α.
25
    and then reasonable variations of it based on that word
```

"Backyard."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- And does Variety contend that the reasonable variations that you just described are themselves trademarks that are protectable?
- My understanding of trademark law is that it Α. extends to those reasonable variations once you have registered it.
- Ο. Excuse me, I didn't mean to interrupt. I'm asking a slightly different question. Does Variety contend it has more than one trademark at issue in this case?
- Α. The trademark we are claiming is the trademark of Backyard. The Backyard and its reasonable variations.
- So it's just the trademark The Backyard and not Backyard BBQ as a separate trademark, correct?
  - Α. That's a variation of The Backyard.
- So could you please tell us, does Variety contend Ο. that it has separate trademark rights in Backyard BBQ separate from the registered The Backyard for lawn and garden services?
- We would claim any uses for the "the" that's been left off of -- from before Backyard that we would have common law rights that -- based on the fact that we've used it going back to 1993.
- Q. So could you explain what common law rights are? 25 To my ear as a lawyer, it sounds like you're saying you're

contending that there are separate trademark rights in Backyard BBQ. Would you clarify that for the jury, please.

- My understanding -- and I'm not an expert in this field. My understanding is that you acquire rights simply by using something in commerce. You can acquire rights in a mark by using them in commerce over a period of time.
- So based on that understanding -- you're the corporate representative for Variety in this case -- does Variety claim that there's more than one trademark that's been infringed?
- We're claiming if anytime it's been used without Α. the "the," that we have rights in that as well.
- So, in effect, Variety is claiming rights in the word Backyard by itself; is that accurate?
- Yes, if we've used Backyard by itself in other Α. ways.
  - You had your deposition taken in this case in 2014; Q. is that correct?
    - Α. That's correct.
  - And at that time, in 2014, you testified that you Q. did not personally recall any uses of Backyard BBQ by Variety as a trademark, right?
    - Yes, I did. Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So as you described earlier today, the senior-most 0. 25 legal employee at the company and you're responsible for the company's trademarks. That's your testimony from earlier today, correct?

- A. Yes. But that was not saying that there weren't such uses. See, I don't --
  - O. You are not --

MR. ADAMS: Objection. Let him finish his answer, your Honor.

- Q. (By Mr. Puzella) Go ahead.
- A. I'm the company's general counsel. I am not the marketing person. I am not the -- I am not the buyer, I am not the one who sets up all the ads. I don't know personally all the ads we've done. I just can't testify to that. I don't deal with them on a daily basis. I deal with them when they get registered or when they get infringed. I don't deal with how they may be used on a day-to-day basis in every circumstance.

I can say that from my examination of the materials we produced in the trademark office proceeding, every time I looked at it, at first I thought, well, here's some that have Backyard without "the," but when we get clearer images of those things, every single time I looked at it, "the" was there. And so -- but I don't know. I can't say that that's true in every single circumstance. And so --

- O. But --
- A. -- for those circumstances where we may not have

used "the," yes, we still claim that Backyard is -- we would have common law rights in that.

- Q. In any event, in 2014 when your deposition was taken, you didn't have any personal knowledge about Variety's use of Backyard BBQ as a trademark, correct?
  - A. Correct.

- Q. Over the course of your testimony today you described at great length Variety's process for the registration of its trademark with the Patent and Trademark Office. Do you recall that?
  - A. I do.
- Q. And you're familiar with patent and trademark practices it seems; is that fair?
  - A. Some of it, yes.
- Q. Certainly enough to testify in front of this jury here today, correct?
- A. I understand practically what I've been called upon in my career to handle in conjunction with outside counsel that does the actual filing.
  - Q. And you're aware, you testified previously, that Walmart applied to register its Backyard Grill with its little design mark at the Patent and Trademark Office, correct?
- A. Correct.
  - Q. You're aware of that fact?

```
1
          Α.
               I am.
 2
               MR. PUZELLA: Could you put up Exhibit D-196,
 3
    please.
 4
          Q.
               (By Mr. Puzella) I'm showing you what's been marked
 5
    as Exhibit D-196, which is --
 6
          Α.
               Do I have that?
 7
          Ο.
               You do. It should be in your binder, sir.
 8
          Α.
               Okay.
 9
              Do you have it?
          Q.
10
              (Perusing exhibit binder). I do.
          Α.
11
               This is Walmart's application for the mark Backyard
          Q.
12
    Grill. Do you see that?
13
               See mark, Backyard Grill.
               I'm sorry, could you read that again, the second
14
          Q.
15
    word is grill?
16
               G-R--L-L.
          Α.
17
               And there's a space where the "I" would be,
          Q.
18
    correct?
19
          Α.
               Correct.
20
               If you could scroll down a bit on the page. To
21
    search the office's database of marks. Do you see that?
                                                                 So
22
    earlier in your testimony of Variety's mark registration
    process you discussed the fact that Variety's mark was
23
24
    compared against other marks on the registry and there were
25
    no marks that the office cited against it so it was allowed
```

to go to publication. Do you remember that?

A. Yes.

- Q. So looking at Walmart's application for its trademark, what did the trademark office say with respect to its search of Walmart's trademark on the registry? Could you read that to the jury, please.
- A. "The trademark examining attorney has searched the office's database of registered and pending marks and has found no conflicting marks that would bar registration under Trademark Act Section 2(d)," and then there's some other statutes there.
- Q. So as of the time that Walmart applied for its trademark, Variety's The Backyard mark was on the registry. It was a registered mark, as you pointed out several times during your testimony, correct?
  - A. That's true.
- Q. And here it states that the examining attorney at the trademark office compared Walmart's mark that it was applying for against the registry and it stated, as you just read, that there were no competing marks that barred its registration; is that accurate?
  - A. That's what it says.
  - Q. Thank you.
- MR. PUZELLA: Just a moment, your Honor. I'm trying to pare this down.

- Q. (By Mr. Puzella) Would you turn to Exhibit P-78,
  please. It may be in the binder labeled D-186.

  A. I found it.

  Q. Do you recall testifying about P-78 in your direct?
  - A. I do.
  - Q. And if you look at the chart that you testified about, let's begin year 2000. You testified that there were \$40 million -- approximately \$40 million spent in advertising over this period. Do you recall that?
- 10 A. Yes.

6

7

8

- 11 Q. Beginning in 2000, does the advertising for these 12 products drop off dramatically?
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. And in the field several to the right in the middle, "Backyard Tabs." Do you see that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. That's the number of individual tabs or circulars that contained The Backyard logo to any degree whatsoever, correct?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So several years there from 1999 through 22 2009, The Backyard appeared once, correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And then in 2010, once; 2011, once; and 2012, twice. Is that correct?

A. Correct.

- Q. Now, on the right hand -- to the right of that there's a percentage column. And do you see that obviously for the years where there was no use, the percentage of use is zero. But for the subsequent uses, there's 33 percent, 17, 17 and 33. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So are those the percentage of overall tabs that were circulated that included Backyard?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So that's not the percentage within the tab that contained a reference to Backyard, it's just a reference to the number of tabs that had Backyard in them someplace?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Correct. Did Variety take the time to try and assess the degree to which the dollars reflected in the far right-hand column were directed just at the Backyard mark and not the entire tab, so the linens and the paper towels and the laundry soap in the tab?
  - A. We looked at doing that initially.
- Q. But you didn't do it. This is for the entire tab, correct?
  - A. Correct. We decided --
  - Q. So dollars shown here are for all the products in a given tab, not advertising dollars just directed at Backyard

Grill?

A. That's correct.

MR. PUZELLA: You can take that down. Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Puzella) Now, you also testified that in August of 2009 Variety sent a letter to a company named Fred's objecting to Fred's use of the trademark Backyard Traditions. Do you recall that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. You talked about the letter that Mr. Adams' firm sent, but you didn't discuss the letter that Fred's sent back, correct?
  - A. I didn't.
    - Q. What is Fred's again?
- A. Fred's is a chain of retail stores similar to Roses, similar to Walmart but smaller, that's based in Memphis, Tennessee.
  - Q. Now, do you see in your binder Defendant's D-50?

    MR. PUZELLA: Could you put that up, please.
- Q. (By Mr. Puzella) Is this the letter that Fred's wrote back to Variety stores in response to the cease and desist letter that you testified about?
  - A. D-50? I don't have a D-50.
- Q. I'm sorry, sir. Maybe we'll just look at the screen then. Is this the letter from Fred's in response to Variety's cease and desist?

1 Α. Yes, it appears to be. 2 If you turn to the second page at the top, Fred's 3 disputed Variety's exclusive right to use the word "backyard" 4 on grills, correct? 5 Α. Correct. 6 And in that letter, Fred identified examples of 7 other companies that have registered and applied to register 8 trademarks containing the term "backyard," right? 9 Α. Correct. 10 And one of the trademarks from other companies that Ο. 11 Fred's identified in its letter was Texas Backyard, correct? 12 Α. Correct. 13 And another of the trademarks that Fred's Ο. identified was Simply Backyards, correct? 14 15 Α. Correct. 16 And it identified Backyard Botanical? Ο. 17 Correct. Α. 18 Backyard Beyond? Q. 19 Α. Correct. 20 Q. Backyard Treasures? 21 Α. Right. 22 Backyard Designs? Ο. 23 Α. Yes. 24 The Backyard Bunch and H-E-B Texas Backyard, Ο.

25

correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. So at least as of the date of Fred's response letter, September 8, 2009, Variety was aware of the company's registrations of the marks containing the term "backyard" that were indicated in the letter at least, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And Variety never conducted any investigation into any of those companies' uses of Backyards, correct?
- A. We weren't commercially aware of them as being -representing any prospect of actual confusion to our
  customers.
- Q. I asked a very specific question, sir. Variety did not conduct any investigation into their uses of Backyard, correct?
  - A. We did not conduct such a search because we didn't see any -- we were not aware of any actual confusion or likelihood of confusion from any of those named.
- Q. And in the Fred's letter, Fred's took the position that Variety's rights in the next paragraph are so limited that its rights are limited to the -- underlined -- precise mark The Backyard for the specific -- underlined again -- lawn and garden goods and services which your client has used on its mark. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. And your testimony on direct was that Fred's agreed

to stop using Backyard Traditions on grills in 2009?

- A. They stopped using it.
- Q. But you don't have a written agreement with Fred's reflecting their agreement to stop selling, correct?
- A. No. It was not done under a written agreement. It was done through communications between officers at our company and officers at their company and then, in fact, they stopped.
- Q. And we just have to rely on your memory then because we don't have a written agreement reflecting their agreement to stop, correct?
  - A. That's true.

MR. PUZELLA: I offer D-50, your Honor.

THE COURT: Received.

## (Defendant's Exhibit No. D-50 received into evidence)

- Q. (By Mr. Puzella) Mr. Blackburn, you agree the word "backyard" is widely used by other companies with regard to grill equipment?
  - A. With grill equipment?
- 20 Q. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

- A. I have testified previously in deposition that the word "backyard" was widely used.
  - Q. So you would agree with that.
- A. That it's widely used on grills? Well, 108 million units of Backyard things have been sold by Walmart, that's

true. So that certainly would be widely used.

- Q. But in your deposition in 2014 you testified that the word "backyard" is widely used on grills?
- A. Yes. At that time you all produced in front of me a stack of pages with various uses of Backyard -- all of a sudden in a deposition -- and I thumbed through them and I saw, yes, Backyard's there. Without being able to check and see were these just statements of use that never got used in commerce, what were they, you know. And so from looking at those it appeared it was widely used and that was without showing -- that was without being able to substantiate that they were widely used actually in commerce as opposed to in those documents that you showed.
- Q. During the case Walmart asked Variety a series of questions in a document called a Request for Admissions. Do you recall that?
  - A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. A Request for Admissions is a document that asks the other side in a lawsuit like this to either admit or deny a fact; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. If you could turn to D-191 in your binder.

    MR. PUZELLA: Please put that up.
- Q. (By Mr. Puzella) This is Variety's responses to Walmart's Request for Admissions?

1 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

- Q. And you reviewed the questions that Walmart asked Variety in this document, correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Could you turn to request number 8 on page 5. And there Variety admitted that it has never filed a legal proceeding in the trademark office against any company --
    - A. Wait a minute. I'm sorry, where are we?
    - Q. Question number 8 on page 5.
    - A. Okay.
  - Q. Do you have it, sir?
- 12 A. Yes.
  - Q. In there Variety admitted that it had never commenced a proceeding before the trademark trial and appeals against marks registered by third parties. That means other companies, right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Unrelated to opposer. That's Variety, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. And incorporating the term "backyard"?
- 21 A. That's correct.
  - Q. And in response to request number 9 on page 5 --
- A. That, of course, was other than that action there.
- 24 The action we commenced against Walmart.
- Q. Sir, your counsel will have an opportunity to

examine you again. I'm just asking you specific questions. Please just answer those, okay?

A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. Request number 9 on page 5, Variety admitted that it has never commenced an action in state or federal court against any third parties for using a mark incorporating the term "backyard." Variety admitted that, correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. The Requests for Admissions also contained a series of questions about specific companies who owned registrations for trademarks containing the word "backyard," right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. For example, in response to request number 62 on page 12, Variety admitted that the trademark Backyard Chef is registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, correct?
- A. Yes.
  - Q. And in response to request number 63 on page 12, Variety admitted that it did not object to the registration of The Backyard Chef trademark, correct?
    - A. Correct.
  - Q. And in response to request number 64 on page 12, Variety admitted that it did not object to the use of The Backyard Chef trademark, correct?
    - A. Correct.

- Q. And another example, request number 65 on page 12, Variety admitted that the trademark Backyard Basics is registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, correct?
  - Α. Correct.
- And in response to request 66, Variety also admitted that it did not object to the registration of The Backyard Basics trademark, correct?
  - Α. Correct.
- And in 67, Variety admitted that it did not object Q. to the use of The Backyard Basics mark, correct?
- 12 Α. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

- 13 Just one more example. Request 140 on page 22. Ο. There Variety admitted that the trademark Backyard Classic is 14 15 registered with the United States Patent and Trademark 16 Office, correct?
  - Wait a minute, I'm not up with you. Α.
  - Sure. Page 22, sir. Q.
- 19 Α. Number 140?
- Yes. Variety admitted that the trademark Backyard Ο. 21 Classic was registered with the United States Patent and 22 Trademark Office, correct?
- 23 Α. Correct.
- 24 And 141, Variety admitted that it did not object to 0. 25 the registration of that mark, correct?

1 A. Correct. 2 O. And 142,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

20

23

24

25

- Q. And 142, Variety also admitted that it did not object to the use of that mark, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. Without going through every example in this document, Exhibit D-191, would it be fair to say that there are more than 40 different trademark registrations with the trademark office that Variety admitted are registered?
  - A. Are registered?
  - O. With the --
  - A. I haven't counted them up. I don't know.
- Q. Well, you can either take my word for it, sir, or you're welcome to count them if you like.
  - A. I'll take your word for it.
  - Q. Okay. And Variety didn't object to any of those registrations, correct?
    - A. Correct. We filed no formal objection.
- Q. And Variety did not object to the use of any of those trademarks, correct?
  - A. Correct.

MR. PUZELLA: Your Honor, I offer the document.

THE COURT: Let it be received.

## (Defendant's Exhibit No. D-191 received into evidence)

Q. (By Mr. Puzella) You testified on direct that Variety has not identified any examples of actual confusion

1 in the marketplace, right? 2 Α. Yes. 3 You're unaware of a single shopper making a Ο. 4 complaint reflecting some confusion between the parties' 5 trademarks, correct? 6 Α. Correct. 7 And Variety didn't conduct any expert surveys to Ο. 8 determine whether consumers are likely to confuse Walmart's 9 trademark and Variety's trademark, correct? 10 Α. We did not. 11 MR. PUZELLA: May I have a moment, your Honor. Ι 12 may be done. 13 (Defense counsel conferring briefly at counsel table off the 14 record) 15 (By Mr. Puzella) Sir, you testified in your direct Q. concerning Variety's sales of Backyard products. Do you 16 17 recall that? 18 Could you repeat that? Α. 19 You testified on your direct concerning the sales 20 of The Backyard products that Variety -- the dollar amount. 21 Do you recall that? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Ο. Has Variety done anything to break out its sales 24 for goods sold using the mark The Backyard on grills

25

particularly?

- A. Just on the grills?
- Q. Yes.

- A. In generating those numbers, it would have been -they would have been generated by SKU, so it wouldn't -- that
  information would have been available, but we were just
  showing the full use of Backyard -- what we have sold under
  that mark.
- Q. But sitting here at the moment, you don't know the dollar amount of grills and grilling accessories that were sold using the mark The Backyard, correct?
  - A. No, I do not know.
- Q. And you also do not know the breakdown among those products as to what products were sold using The Backyard, the registered mark, or Backyard BBQ, or just Backyard standing alone; is that correct?
- A. I am not aware of uses -- I haven't found any uses myself -- this is what I was testifying to earlier -- of the mark other than using The Backyard. I haven't found one yet. I told you we claimed rights in it. If it had been used, in case it had been used, but we -- I have so far not discovered any such uses.
  - MR. PUZELLA: No further questions, your Honor.
- THE COURT: Any redirect?
- MR. ADAMS: Just a few, your Honor.

25 ///

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ADAMS:

2.1

- Q. Mr. Blackburn, turning back to D-196. This is the paper from the Patent and Trademark Office that indicated that the trademark office had not found any conflicting marks with Walmart's trademark application. Do you remember that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And it also says that any registered or pending marks, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What does that tell you about types of trademarks that the trademark office does not consider in determining whether or not a trademark is registerable?
- A. Marks that may have been used and have common law
  marks as opposed to those that have actually been registered.
  - Q. Like the marks that Variety had been using, The Backyard BBQ and some of the others that were not registered?
    - A. Yes.
  - Q. So the trademark office would not have been aware of any of those uses, would they?
    - A. No.
    - Q. Now, you've also testified about the opposition.

      Do you understand what the purpose of the trademark

      opposition is after a trademark has been allowed by the

      trademark office?

- A. Precisely so that objections like the one we brought could be brought. That's the whole point. You have the opportunity to object and to come in and that the trademark office will listen to the facts of the matter.
- Q. And that's exactly what Variety did in this case, correct?
  - A. Correct.
- Q. It filed an opposition against the allowance of this trademark based on information that the trademark office did not have, correct?
- A. Correct.
- 12 Q. And that proceeding is still pending, is it not?
- 13 A. It is.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. So the Trademark Office has never allowed Walmart's trademark application on Backyard Grill, has it?
  - A. They have not.
- Q. Now, turning to D-50, this is a letter from the lawyers for Fred's?
- 19 A. I don't have that.
- Q. We'll bring you the copy, Mr. Blackburn. While
  he's doing that I'll ask you, how many cease and desist
  letters have you seen in your legal career?
- 23 A. A lot.
- Q. And is there a typical way that a lawyer responds to a cease and desist letter?

1 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Do the lawyers typically throw up their hands and say, oh, you're exactly right, we're so sorry?
  - A. No.
  - Q. Is it more likely than not that the typical response to a cease and desist letter is like the one that Walmart showed you?
    - A. Like the one Walmart showed me.
  - Q. Yes. But after Fred's lawyer sent you -- sent that letter back, what did Fred's do?
    - A. Stopped selling.
  - Q. Thank you. Now turn to D-91. Mr. Puzella went down a laundry list of marks and registration numbers,
    - A. Yes.
    - Q. And he asked you whether or not Variety had opposed or taken some action against those registrations, correct?
      - A. Yes.
    - Q. Did Walmart furnish any evidence to Variety in submitting those requests that any of those trademarks were actually still in use?
      - A. No.
- Q. Did Walmart submit any information for you to
  consider about what particular goods or services any of those
  registrations may be related to?

1 Α. No. 2 MR. ADAMS: No further questions. 3 Your Honor, we would like to move into evidence 4 three more exhibits. P-22, 59 and 79. 5 THE COURT: They'll be received. (Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. P-22, 59 and 79 received into 6 7 evidence) 8 MR. PUZELLA: May I have a minute, your Honor? 9 THE COURT: This witness can step down. 10 (Witness Excused) 11 THE COURT: Do you have another witness? 12 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, at this time we have a 13 deposition designation whereby we will be reading excerpts of testimony from one of Walmart's witnesses, Ms. Dineen. 14 15 was deposed during this litigation. 16 THE COURT: All right. 17 All right. One of the attorneys for MR. ADAMS: 18 Variety, Ms. Trimmer, will, and with the Court's permission, 19 sit in the witness box and read Ms. Dineen's answers. 20 THE COURT: This is the testimony of someone that 21 was taken at another time under the Rules of Procedure and 22 Evidence. They're not here today to actually present 23 themselves, but their sworn testimony is going to be read to 24 you by the lawyer and someone standing in for the witness. 25 MR. PUZELLA: Just to close the loop, your Honor,

```
1
    on the documents that the plaintiffs would like to admit, 22,
 2
    59 and 79. No objections for 22 and 59, but 79 is a page
 3
    from a treatise. It's -- it wasn't testified to by the
 4
    witness.
 5
                          All right. Disallowed.
              THE COURT:
 6
              MR. PUZELLA: So we object.
 7
              MR. ADAMS: We'll withdraw that request as to 79.
 8
              THE COURT: All right.
 9
                (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 79 withdrawn)
10
           (Attorney Trimmer approached the witness stand)
11
              MR. ADAMS: Just -- your Honor, is it your
12
    practice -- anything further I should say to the jury, you
13
    should say to the jury about the way this process works other
14
    than what's already been said?
15
              THE COURT: I just told them that this is a witness
    who will be identified who was taken -- whose testimony was
16
17
    taken under oath earlier in time and it's admissible under
18
    the Rules of Procedure in this trial.
19
              MR. ADAMS: Thank you, your Honor.
20
              MR. HOSP: Your Honor, this witness is available
21
    tomorrow. It's not clear why the deposition designation is
22
    being used.
23
              THE COURT: I don't know.
24
              MR. ADAMS: Well, we say Ms. Dineen's name --
25
              THE COURT: It's their party, right?
```

```
1
              MR. ADAMS: Right.
 2
               THE COURT: So you can use it as testimony of an
 3
    adverse witness.
 4
               MR. ADAMS: Anything she said is an admission
 5
    against Walmart's interest. She was a 30(b)(6) witness.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
 7
               MR. ADAMS: All right, Ms. Trimmer, step into the
 8
    role of Ms. Dineen for the next little while.
 9
                             KAREN DINEEN
10
     having been duly sworn, testified as follows via deposition
11
       testimony [as read into the record by Attorney Trimmer]:
12
                          DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. ADAMS:
13
               Would you state your name for the record.
14
         Q.
15
              Karen Dineen.
         Α.
               You need to speak up just a little bit.
16
         Ο.
17
              Karen Dineen.
         Α.
18
               I'd like you to turn to the first excerpt, which I
         Q.
19
    think is on page 12.
20
               And you understand with regard to this 30(b)(6)
21
    notice that you're here not testifying in your individual
22
    capacity, but as a representative of Walmart. Do you
    understand that?
23
24
         Α.
               Yes.
25
              And do you also understand that you have been
         Q.
```

tendered as one who has sufficient knowledge in these areas of inquiry to give full and complete answers; is that correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. On page 24. Okay. Who does Walmart consider its biggest competitors in the sale of grills and grill accessories?
- A. Overall, I think we look at almost everybody who sells the same categories and gives the customer another choice in these categories. Recently, primarily some of the biggest competition has come from home improvement stores like, for example, a Home Depot.
- Q. I understand you to say that -- just before that part of your answer that you really consider all companies that sell grill and grill accessories to be a Walmart competitor; is that right?
- A. Yes. We have a broad base of customers and they have many choices, so we really can't overlook too many competitors.
- Q. So about when was it that Walmart decided to adopt a new trademark for grill and grill accessories? So the question is -- I'm sorry --
  - A. So the question is?
    - Q. About when was that?
  - A. When was that. That would have been in probably

the second half of 2010.

- Q. Who would have been the one or two individuals that would have been most responsible for conceiving and pushing this idea forward? The one that began say in the second half of 2010 to have a private brand grill program?
  - A. Marvin Deshommes.
  - Q. Anyone else?
  - A. Erick Moreira and MiKaela Lemmon.
- Q. And just based on your understanding, how did that program proceed just generally? Again, we -- we'll look at some exhibits, but right now I just want to get an overview of what happened.
- A. Initially Marvin from the category gave the challenge to Erick, who was a director on the brand team, to develop a private brand for grilling categories. So how that process went, Erick brainstormed on names that would resonate with the customer in these categories. Then a preliminary legal search is done which most often narrows it down. With those names, we conduct customer insights to see what the customer thinks. That usually narrows it down again, and then we go back to legal for a more complete search and then, if necessary, perhaps go back out to customer insights. And then we would take all of the data points, the brand team would make a recommendation to the merchants and get the approvals.

```
1
              MR. HOSP: Your Honor --
 2
               (By Mr. Adams) So is that what you believe
 3
    happened in this case?
 4
         Α.
              Yes.
 5
         Q.
              So it's your testimony --
 6
              MR. HOSP: Your Honor, objection. Objection, just
 7
    for the record. It's being introduced for an improper
 8
    purpose.
 9
              THE COURT: What's that?
10
                          I'm just objecting because it's being
              MR. HOSP:
11
    introduced for an improper purpose. This relates to the memo
12
    that we had filed regarding the privilege issue.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. Overruled.
14
              MR. ADAMS: I'm sorry, it doesn't, your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: Overruled. Let's go ahead. Is this a
16
    long deposition or a couple minutes?
17
              MR. ADAMS: It's not a couple minutes, but it's not
18
    a long one either.
              THE COURT: What's your "not a long one"?
19
20
              MR. ADAMS: Eight minutes.
21
              THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and get rid of it.
22
               (By Mr. Adams) So it's your testimony that in
         Ο.
    roughly March or May of 2011, at that point you were
23
24
    finalizing this as The Backyard Grill name, yes?
25
         Α.
              Yes.
```

- Q. Now, turn to page 30. Okay. When did Walmart --
  - A. I'm sorry, what page?
  - Q. I'm sorry, page 30.
  - A. Thank you.

- Q. Okay. When did Walmart -- and again, there may be people at Walmart, probably are, that you have no knowledge of and I'm asking you to answer within your own knowledge -- but as far as you know, when did you or anyone you spoke to at Walmart first become aware that Variety Stores and Variety Wholesalers were selling grills that included the word "backyard"?
- A. We -- and this is the we -- so the brand team that was working on this at the time is the we, okay -- became aware that Variety Stores had registered the name The Backyard in our development process, so that would have been in early 2011.
- Q. And how was it that you learned about the registration?

19 MR. HOSP: Same objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. We were made aware of it from our legal team.
- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Okay. Did Walmart do any follow-up to gain any further information about how Variety was using the trademark?
- 25 A. Yeah. We were made aware of it -- of what I had

- said before. The Variety -- that Variety had registered the name The Backyard.
  - Q. Now 34. I'm handing you a -- the witness a document marked for identification as Exhibit 20. Can you identify this document, Exhibit 20, for the record, please.
  - A. Yes. This is a result of a customer insight survey.
    - Q. Who produced this survey?
  - A. The company is MAPS, and we also refer to this -refer this to a LUCI survey. LUCI study. I'm not sure, yet
    it does show up on here. The LUCI.
    - Q. Is that an acronym for something?
  - A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. What?
- A. It's a very good acronym. Sometimes we forget what they stand for, but I do recall. I think it's Learning and Understanding Consumer Insights to the best of my recollection.
  - Q. And what particular product or product categories was this survey directed towards?
    - A. This was for grills.
- Q. All right. Now, look at this and my understanding, correct me if I'm wrong, is that there are a series of questions that are contained or that's a totalization of responses to questions, numbered questions in this document,

correct?

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. Yes.
- Q. All right. So let's take an example. T-1 would be question one, correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Starting on the front page, which is WMOO675, I see as I flip through the pages that there seem to be a number of different terms. Grill Mark, for example. Grill Time, Grill Master, Grill Works. Do you know how these names were selected?
  - A. Yes. These names were selected -- some from the brand team brainstorming ideas for names for our private brand and some names that were already existing in the market that we wanted to measure the new ideas against.
  - Q. I see. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I didn't see Backyard Grill identified as one of these. Is that your understanding as well?
    - A. Correct.
    - Q. Is there a particular reason for that?
- 20 A. Yes. This looks like it was the initial round of
  21 names, and it was not in the initial group of names we looked
  22 at.
  - Q. And do you know why not?
- A. It didn't come up through the process of the brainstorming by the brand team at that time.

- Q. All right. Okay. Turn it over to page 687, which is a few pages in. This will be the case, I think, also for Q-1, but for Q-2 I see a reference to Backyard Barbecue. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. So that was one of the initial choices that was being sampled and tested, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And can you -- you may need to flip through here just for a second, but can you characterize based on your own understanding how that ranked in terms of the other marks that were being sampled at that time?
- A. Backyard Barbecue did come up in the customer insights, not in the top. In this initial round of customer insights it did not come up in the top names.
  - Q. What were the top two or three names?
- A. It was Grill Master, and I think we provided this.

  I would be guessing at the other ones. It's in there. Grill

  Master was one.
- Q. All right. Page 40. Do you know why that's the case, why Grill Master wasn't chosen as Walmart's private brand of barbecue grills?
  - A. Okay. So yes.
- Q. And why was that?
- A. It was not available for use for a private brand.

Q. And how do you know that?

MR. HOSP: Same objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. From our legal team's advice or legal team's information.
- Q. (By Mr. Adams) Now turn to 46. I'm going to hand you a document marked for identification as Exhibit 25. I tried to group these the way it seemed to me they were produced. In other words, if there's something together like this, it's my understanding they should go together by all means, but if you think for whatever reason they don't go together, just let me know.

I'm going to skip down to line 11. All right. If you look squarely in the middle of the first page, you see "Grill LUCI XLSX." Is that the attachment you see to this?

- A. I believe it is.
- Q. So let's go back to the first page of this exhibit. It says, "MiKaela and Joe, I think you meant to say these two names." We'll skip over that. "These two names are very close." Which two names do you understand was being compared? Which two names are very close?
  - A. Grill Works and Backyard Barbecue.
- Q. And it says, "Based on this information, Grill Works, top three box, 25 percent versus Backyard Barbecue 18 percent. I would recommend Grill Works." Did I read that

correctly?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And this document is dated December 17, 2010. So based on your earlier testimony, this would have been fairly early in the program process, correct, picking a name for your private brand?
  - A. Yes. This was the first insight survey we did.
- Q. Okay. There is -- okay. There was a particular reason why Walmart didn't just go ahead at this point and adopt Grill Works for its private brand trademark?
  - A. Yes.

MR. HOSP: Same objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) What was that? That's at line ten.
- A. Okay. So after the step of getting insights, the next step, as I stated previously, was to do a more complete legal search. And after consulting with legal on this, we decided not to go forward with Grill Works.
- Q. Okay. At that point do you know why Walmart simply didn't take the second choice, which was Backyard Barbecue, especially when he says, "We are truly splitting hairs with these findings"? Wouldn't Backyard Barbecue have been almost as good?
- A. Okay. So it would have been the next choice, and in one of the next steps it did become the next choice.

Q. Okay. And is there a particular reason why Walmart did not adopt Backyard Barbecue as its private brand grill trademark?

MR. HOSP: Same objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. Okay. Yes. After consulting with legal, we decided not to move forward with Backyard Barbecue.
- Q. (By Mr. Adams) All right. Ms. Dineen, I've handed you a document marked for identification as Exhibit 26. Would you just take a moment and look at that and I'll ask you a couple questions.
  - A. Okay.

- Q. Now, this refers -- up at the very top it says, "Just an update. I've asked Brent for a timeline on the second round of research of grills, et cetera." You've testified about the second round already, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Below it says, quote, in the meantime, we need to determine which names we want to pursue for that research based on what we now know we cannot use, close quotes. Does that refer to the legal advice you had previously received about certain names that simply weren't available?

MR. HOSP: Same objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

A. Yes. The second round is based on the information

we received since the customer insights and then looking at which names now we want to look at going forward.

- Q. (By Mr. Adams) All right. Over to page 51. So I hand you a document marked for identification as Exhibit 27, Ms. Dineen. We're still in 2010, correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. So this is still at a relatively early stage of selecting a trademark for grill -- grills program, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, what do you interpret the statement, quote, please add Barbecue Master, close quotes, to mean? Yeah, let's just look down on the document. Do you see just below the subject that says, quote, please add BBQ Master, close quotes. Do you know what that refers to?
- A. Wanting to get further insight or information on the name BBQ Master.
- Q. So that was added to the survey effectively for the second round; is that right?
- A. I would have to look. I don't know which has been added to, a survey or a different list.
- Q. All right. I'm going to skip over to page 52 -- I'm sorry -- 53, line 17. I think the question was, the statement is Backyard Barbecue seems too long a name. Is that your understanding, that that was at least one reason among perhaps others why Walmart did not select Backyard

Barbecue as its private brand grill trademark?

- A. No. I think at the time of the decision that was not a factor.
- Q. Page 58. Let me hand you a copy of Exhibit 28 -- 29, Ms. Dineen. If you would, please take a couple minutes or however much time you need to look at this.
  - A. Okay.

- Q. Can you identify this document for the record?
- A. This is another round of customer insights for a grill and grill accessories private brand.
  - Q. Okay. And what's the date on this document?
  - A. It was prepared by MAPS on 2/9/11.
- Q. Okay. Now, this is roughly maybe eight or nine months prior to the end of the use of the mark based on your testimony just a few moments ago, right? I think you said the date of first use, that you thought it was around the fourth quarter of 2011?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that at this point you're still considering which trademark to use or not use?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And can you characterize -- just based on your understanding and knowledge of this document -- how it shook out in terms of the most favorable mark for use?
  - A. One thing that we did learn from this is that we

had several new names that resonated with the customer better than our existing private brand, Mainstays, that had been in grill -- in grill accessories but had never been in grills.

As far as the top names in this round, I don't recall exactly the top names here, but I know this had -- had led us after using some of the other processes to consider Backyard

Barbecue.

- Q. Does Backyard Grill appear in this study?
- A. No.
- Q. Okay. Does Backyard Grill appear on any of these MAPS studies before it was selected by Walmart for use?
- 12 A. Yes.

- 13 Q. Which ones?
  - A. It was after this one dated 2/9/11, yes.
  - Q. Now over to page 61. Okay. I hand you a document marked for identification as Exhibit 32. Would you take a look at this and identify it for the record.
    - A. Okay.
  - Q. Reading from the top of this document it says,

    "Spoke with Erick and the name for the private label and

    grill shop looks to be, quote, Backyard Barbecue, close

    quotes. I endorsed the name understanding what is available

    to us."
  - Okay. Now, what do you understand this offer to mean when he says, quote, I endorsed the name understanding

what is available to us, close quotes?

- A. Yes. This is from Dena, who was the vice-president of the total outdoor living complex then, and getting her endorsement on the name pending next steps that we would take -- next steps that we would take and information we would get.
  - Q. Okay. And this document is dated roughly when?
- A. The e-mail below it is February 22nd. I don't see a date. I would think it's not too far after that.
- Q. All right. Down to line 13. And what was the plan B name?
- A. One of them was Backyard Grill, which we did end up selecting. If there were other ones in the survey, they would be in those documents. I can't recall now.
- Q. Okay. Well, considering that in this document the name Backyard Grill is being endorsed as the name to be used, why is it that it wasn't used?
- A. Okay. After going to one of our next steps with further research with legal and consulting with legal, we decided not to move forward with Backyard Barbecue.

MR. HOSP: Same objection.

MR. ADAMS: Excuse me, Mr. --

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Shaw noted in my question I said Backyard Grill instead of Backyard Barbecue. So correct

```
1
    that.
 2
              All right. Top of page 64. We're almost through,
 3
    your Honor.
 4
         Q.
               (By Mr. Adams) Go ahead, Ms. Dineen. Top of page
 5
    64.
 6
         Α.
              Okay. After going to one of our next steps with
 7
    further research with legal and consulting with legal, we
 8
    decided not to move forward with Backyard Barbecue.
 9
              All right. Well, look down at the e-mail in the
10
    lower half of that page, the one you referenced dated
11
    February 22, 2011. Doesn't this indicate that the name
12
    Backyard BBQ had already cleared legal and customer insights
13
    on potential names?
              One step. As our process, I explained, we would
14
         Α.
15
    brainstorm and develop names, do a preliminary legal search,
16
    do customer insights, and then do a more complete search.
                                                                So
17
    that may be referencing one of the legal searches.
18
              MR. ADAMS: Okay. Your Honor, I'm going to end at
```

MR. ADAMS: Okay. Your Honor, I'm going to end at this point. I'll take up -- I'll take up the rest of this with Ms. Dineen during cross-examination.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I move into evidence PX-71 and 72 -- I'm sorry, P-71 and P-72, P-14.

MR. HOSP: We have objected, your Honor, but we understand your ruling.

THE COURT: All right. Let them be received.

## 1 (Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. P-71, P-72 and P-14 received into 2 evidence) 3 THE COURT: Do you have any other witnesses today? 4 MR. ADAMS: No, we do not, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Are you resting? MR. ADAMS: Well, we need to make sure that we have 6 7 all our exhibits in evidence; otherwise, yes, we are. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Well, check it out. 9 MR. ADAMS: Okay. 10 MR. PUZELLA: We may have objections to the 11 documents that were just offered. We couldn't hear what they 12 were. So if we could just hear the numbers again. MS. GARKO: 71, 72 and --13 (Defense counsel briefly conferring at counsel table off the 14 15 record) 16 MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, we would offer Plaintiff's 17 Exhibit 5, which is the side-by-side demonstrative exhibit we 18 had on the easel during my opening statement. 19 THE COURT: That will be received. 20 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. P-5 received into evidence) 21 MS. GARKO: I'm sorry, your Honor, so the record is 22 clear, I believe they meant PX-5, not Exhibit P-5. 23 MS. TRIMMER: It's Exhibit P-5. 24 MR. LONG: It's P-5. It was just blown up large. 25 (Plaintiff's counsel conferring briefly at counsel table off

```
1
                             the record)
 2
              MR. ADAMS: I think we have everything, your Honor.
 3
    Thank you.
 4
              THE COURT: All right. Then you rest.
 5
              And I'm going to let the jury go and we'll begin
 6
    tomorrow at 9:30 with your case.
 7
              MR. PUZELLA: Yes, your Honor. We have a Rule 50
 8
    motion. Should we address that after?
 9
              THE COURT: I understand. I'm going to just deal
10
    with the jury.
11
              MR. PUZELLA: Very good.
12
              THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, so we'll come
13
    back tomorrow at 9:30 and don't talk to anybody about the
14
    case, don't form any conclusive opinions. Just leave it out
15
    of your mind. Put your books back in the jury room and
    they'll be secure and locked and you can pick them up
16
17
    tomorrow. Everybody okay to come back at 9:30? Okay. Good.
18
              Well, have a good evening and safe drive and we'll
19
    see you tomorrow.
20
              I'll stay on the bench while the jury goes out.
21
                       (Jury out at 4:56 p.m.)
22
              THE COURT: You have a Rule 50 motion?
23
              MR. PUZELLA: Yes, your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: I'll hear that in the morning.
25
              MR. PUZELLA: Very good.
```

```
THE COURT: Thank you. We'll be prepared for
 1
 2
    tomorrow. Thank you.
 3
               We'll be in recess.
 4
 5
                     (Hearing adjourned at 4:58 p.m.)
 6
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
3	
4	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER
5	
6	I, Michelle A. McGirr, RPR, CRR, CRC, Federal
7	Official Court Reporter, in and for the United States
8	District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, do
9	hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United
10	States Code, that the foregoing is a true and accurate
11	transcript of my stenographically reported proceedings held
12	in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page
13	format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial
14	Conference of the United States.
15	
16	Dated this 15th day of November, 2018
17	
18	/s/ <u>Michelle A. McGirr</u> MICHELLE A. McGIRR
19	RPR, CRR, CRC U.S. Official Court Reporter
20	0.5. Official Court Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	